

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1850.

---

ART. I. — THE IMPORTANCE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOL-  
OGY, AND THE DUTY OF THE UNITARIAN CLERGY  
IN RELATION TO IT.

[An Address, read before the Ministerial Conference in Boston, May 29,  
1850. By GEORGE W. BURNAP, D. D.]

THE arrangement which has been made to secure at least one address to this conference each year, on some theological subject, has my entire approbation. It seems to me to be demanded by our position, both as seekers and defenders of the truth as it is in Jesus. It is due to ourselves, not only as ministers of the Gospel, but as intellectual and studious men, already pledged by our ordination vows and our individual convictions, to devote our best powers to the promotion of theological science, the true knowledge of God, of Christ, of our duty, and our destiny. It is demanded of us by the position we occupy before the world. We have presumed to dissent from some of the leading dogmas of the great body of the Christian world, — to demolish, so to speak, the theological edifice which ages have been building up. Its scattered materials lie all about us. The world has a right to demand of us that we do not stop here. They have a right to ask of us that we reconstruct those materials; and, moreover, that we raise up a more perfect and beautiful structure than that which we pull down.



Short of this they will not be satisfied, and, moreover, they will hold us guilty of a species of sacrilege, in having destroyed that which we are unable to replace. The human mind demands something positive; it must have a system of theology; and if the sects of Protestantism cannot furnish one, it will go back blindfold into the Church of Rome, and learn by heart the scholastic dogmas of the Dark Ages.

I wish to impress upon the younger members of the clerical profession the necessity of the study of theology for their own sakes, for the growth, expansion, and discipline of their own minds. A clergyman's life, of all others, ought to be one of perpetual progress. His talents are given him, not that he may hide them in a napkin and bury them in the earth, but that they may be increased; the two talents must grow into two talents more, and he that hath five must not rest satisfied till he has added to them five talents besides. There is really no satisfactory reason why a clergyman should not go on to improve as long as he lives, or at least till his faculties are benumbed by the hebetude of old age.

But what do we too often see? A youth of promise succeeded by mediocrity in later years, — or, even worse than this, an actual decline of intellectual and moral power before the physical system gives any sign of decay. The years of academic life are usually marked by rapid advancement. An impetus is acquired which usually lasts for a considerable distance into professional life. Why is it not kept up? So we see a vessel launched. It slides down its artificial pathway, and enters upon its future element with a rush, not without clapping of hands and shouts of gratulation. But she is merely launched. That extraneous and artificial force which she gets but once, and never can renew, cannot suffice her for the shortest voyage. She has resistance to overcome; but, with neither sails to help her, nor the force of imprisoned elements to impel her on, her motion becomes less and less, till at last she stops, and idly dances on the waves, or floats back towards the shore. Such is the history of too many clergymen. In a few years their academic impetus is spent. They cease to make any new acquisitions; they even begin to lose the freshness of their original professional attainments, and be-



come incapable either of leading other minds, or maintaining that respect which is absolutely necessary to their usefulness in the Church. And why is this? The main cause is the abandonment of elementary studies. There is no growth of mind without these. The great reason why the years of academic life are marked by such rapid advancement is, that the mind is constantly exercised in elementary studies. The greatest proficient in music, those prodigies, as they are regarded by the world, who move whole cities by their coming, and hold multitudes as if bound by a spell of enchantment, pass a considerable part of each day in practising the gamut, and in making themselves familiar with the simplest principles of their art.

So in the graver pursuits of the clergyman, the indispensable condition of continued improvement is constant recurrence to elementary studies, — to theology, and those branches of knowledge and accomplishment which are subsidiary to it, metaphysics, ethics, Biblical criticism, and the classics. In order to grow, the mind must grapple with subjects which task its powers to the full, just as the athlete makes it a point of discipline to strain his muscles every day to their utmost capacity. He who abandons elementary studies necessarily ceases to grow. The clergyman is under strong temptations to do this. He finds it an easier and more agreeable employment to read reviews and miscellaneous literature. He may satisfy his conscience with this apology for mental application, but it produces on him the inevitable effect of weakening his powers, and incapacitating his mind for taking broad, deep, original, or thorough views of any thing. With such habits, if he do not dwindle, he will not advance. But the probability is, that the mischief will not stop here. Nothing is easier than for a clergyman to waste a day in pursuits apparently literary and legitimate, but which are in fact useless, if not pernicious. And how many days are thus wasted in desultory employments, in mere dread and aversion of the tug and toil of real study, of thorough investigation, of original thought, of patient elaboration! But things may even wax worse. Reviews and light literature may become too heavy and laborious, and the academical alumnus may round his literary career by reading the daily and



weekly newspapers, and content himself in the pulpit with ringing changes on Scripture phraseology. My brethren, unless I greatly deceive myself, we in our day and generation are called to lead a life totally different from this. God has cast our lot in an age in which the inducements to theological study are more intense than ever existed before. The angel of truth is now at last unbound. Religious knowledge may now make more progress in one year than it could in a century a thousand years ago. The total severance of church and state has withdrawn the frown of temporal powers from the honest seeker for God's truth. We belong to a division of Christ's fold who have dared to throw ourselves back on the teachings of our Master, and to hold ourselves answerable only to the written word, as it is known and read of all men.

With this entire freedom, we are endeavouring to construct theology anew. If any thing can be real in the position we occupy, it is this, — *our mission is theological reform.* It is to free Christianity from the accretions of fifteen hundred years, to discriminate its true elements from Judaism on the one hand, and Paganism on the other, — from the subtleties of the schoolmen and from the profane adulterations of philosophical speculation, — from the slavery of dead forms and from that ultra-spiritualism which denies the necessity of any. This, then, let me repeat it, is, in my judgment, the mission of the Unitarian body at the present hour. It is theological reform. And how are we to fulfil it? I know the answer I should receive from too large a number of those who bear our name. "Let things take their own course. Let theology take care of itself. When the world is ready for better views, it will get them without our instrumentality." I reply, that this would be a most pusillanimous abandonment of a noble position and a noble cause. For what have we been contending for the last thirty years? Why did we form a separate organization? Was it not for the assertion and maintenance of great and important principles, and are not those principles theological? Have we not said, over and over again, that we deem these principles vital to our welfare and the welfare of society? Shall we pause here, take back all we have said, shrink away from the issue we have made, and abandon theology to take care of itself?



We *must have* a theology, — a systematic, positive theology. We want it for ourselves, we want it for those who are without. The laws of the human mind demand it. They demand a theology which shall cover the whole ground, which shall be consistent with itself, which shall be consistent with the Scriptures, which will explain the Scriptures, and which reason does not reject. No cause can be strong without a clear and explicit statement of principles; and no cause can be strong without principles capable of a clear and explicit statement. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle." An army must have a standard which represents great truths, or symbolizes great objects, or it will be inspired by no enthusiasm and act with no efficiency.

We want a systematic theology for ourselves. The generation which established our churches were necessarily acquainted with our theology. They knew its distinctive doctrines; they knew, too, the doctrines to which they were opposed. It was their deliberate preference of the one to the other, which led them to seek a separate organization. They are now passing off the stage. Their children must adopt our faith, not as they did, by controversy, but by education. Now nothing can be well taught which is not reduced to a system. The faiths now subsisting have an immense advantage in this particular. They are systematized and condensed into manuals of every size and adaptation, from the ponderous quarto down to the thinnest catechism. Millions of these are printed and distributed every year. In this way, millions of children are furnished at an early age with a theology elaborated and adjusted by the combined skill and acuteness of hundreds of successive thinkers, reasoners, and writers. The whole Bible has been explained in accordance with these different systems, and, as an unavoidable consequence, the language of Scripture ever after seems to them to speak the sentiments which have thus been early associated with it, and thus theological systems are handed down from age to age, not because they are true, but because they are reduced to a system, and taught systematically, as embodying the very substance and essence of the Scriptures. And what have we to oppose to all this? Absolutely nothing.



It would seem that we are either too timid, too indolent, or too undecided, or, still worse, too indifferent, to have a theology.

We want a theology for those who are without the pale of our faith. It is a reproach universally cast upon us, that our faith is a negative one, that our creed consists of articles of unbelief. We ourselves know that this is not true. Christianity is a *faith*, a belief, not an unbelief. If it is not a faith, something to be believed, it is nothing. We preach, we strive to affect the *convictions* of mankind,—of course we preach something that is to be believed. What is that something? I have charity enough to think that the world really wishes to know what that something is. We are united in one body, we preach alike, or at least men say we do, and we act together. We exchange pulpits, and our own people do not discern any important variation of doctrine. What are the doctrines we preach?—this is the very thing which the world wishes to know, and which it is for their good and ours that they should know.

To place ourselves, then, right before the world, to remove the reproach of teaching mere negations, and of laying out our whole strength in showing men what they are to *reject*, we must have a theology, a systematic, affirmative theology,—one which will be consistent with the Scriptures, which will explain the Scriptures, and at the same time be deep enough and spiritual enough to sound all the depths of religious experience.

I have said that we must have a systematic theology. I assert this from my own conviction and from personal experience. Placed in a state of isolation for more than twenty years, I have been often led to look at our faith from without, and have heard every possible objection which can be brought against it. There is in this country, very generally diffused, a knowledge of the Scriptures, and of different theological systems, with the exception of our own. So much is this the case, that the most illiterate, on hearing a theological doctrine advanced, are able immediately to recur to those texts of Scripture which seem to be inconsistent with it. The texts which seem to be inconsistent with our faith must be explained, and the explanation must be made accessible to the great mass of the people. Short of this, our doc-



trines cannot obtain a very wide reception. Metaphysical systems and opinions, too, are involved in theology, and are discussed by people of the commonest education, with no small amount of ingenuity and acuteness. In fact, the subject of religion is so intensely interesting to every human being, that every man who thinks at all is more or less a theologian. This being the case, I hold it to be self-evident that our doctrines can have no secure basis, and our cause no assured progress and establishment in the world, without an elaborated theology, which is shown by fair explanation to express the true meaning of the sacred oracles. So long as a single text remains unexplained, more stress will be laid upon it than upon a hundred plain texts of an opposite bearing, and all antecedent probabilities on the other side.

But it may be asked, How shall we get such a theology? I answer, by studying theology, and by every man's contributing something according to his peculiar talent, taste, and inclination. Theology must rise as the wall did about Jerusalem, by every man's building over against his own house. No one mind is capable of doing it all, but many minds are capable of doing it, and then one mind may digest the whole into a consistent system.

But some, I am aware, may be held back by an undefined apprehension that it is dangerous to study theology. The theological inquirer is in imminent peril of dashing against the Scylla of Rationalism on the one hand, or of being swallowed up by the Charybdis of Transcendentalism on the other.

Let us examine this matter. What is Rationalism, that we should have such a dread of it? and what is Transcendentalism, that we should imagine it so dangerous? Perhaps we may find that we are all Rationalists, and all Transcendentalists, and all no less Christians at the same time.

Rationalism professes to be the result of the examination of the claims of Christianity to our belief and allegiance as a supernatural communication from God, *by reason*, or the essential laws of the human mind. In Germany, it has assumed the form of a species of philosophy, which begins by denying the *possibility* of a supernatural revelation, and, of course, the validity of any



evidence that can be brought forward to prove that any such has ever been made. Of this species of Rationalism I do not think that we, on this side of the Atlantic, are in much danger. We say, that, under this view of things, the very word Rationalism is a *petitio principii*, an assumption of the question in dispute. It assumes that it is *irrational* to believe any thing supernatural. All belief in Christianity, of course, must be idolatry and superstition. The Anglo-Saxon mind, in my judgment, will never be brought to acquiesce in any such logical fallacy as this.

About a century ago, Hume proposed nearly the same thesis to the English people, with the slightest possible success. Half a century earlier, John Locke, a man somewhat greater than David Hume, published a treatise in England on "The Reasonableness of Christianity, as revealed in the Scriptures." The judgment of the English and American people has hitherto been, that John Locke is right, and his reasoning conclusive; that David Hume is wrong, and his reasoning sophistical.

The other phasis of Rationalism is, that, admitting the possibility of both revelation and miracle, a candid examination of the Bible leads to the rejection of that part of the Scripture which contains a record of either. This is an open and a fair question, which every inquirer must meet and settle for himself. But there is nothing new or startling in it. Its examination makes a part of every thorough theological education. It comes up for reëxamination in the mind of every clergyman, from time to time, as long as he lives. There is not a clergyman in Christendom who does not act on rationalistic principles every day of his life, — even those who are considered to abandon themselves most entirely to authority. The fact is, that reason and faith are two principles in the human mind not antagonistic to each other, but which God hath joined together, and which can never be divorced. There is nothing which any man professes to believe, concerning which the question may not be immediately asked, *Why* do you believe it? That is to say, What *reason* have you for believing it? If he can give no reason, what he professes to believe is justly considered to rest on no better foundation than mere credulity or superstition. Reason is placed by God as the sentinel



at the entrance of the mind, to decide what is to be admitted into it as truth, and what is to be rejected. Man's safety and welfare demand that this sentinel should faithfully perform his duty; and it is as dangerous to admit into the mind that which is false, as to reject that which is true. Any thing which presents itself under the garb of a revelation cannot legitimately be permitted to escape the scrutiny of this sentinel, merely because it professes to be a revelation. All theologians act on this principle, and use their reason in the examination of doctrines which others profess to find in the language of Scripture. All theologians are Rationalists to this extent, that they make reason to be at least coördinate with Scripture, inasmuch as they reject on the ground of reason the literal sense of the Scripture, and adopt another because it is reconcilable with reason. The Catholic rejects the literal meaning of the words of Scripture on the ground of its repugnance to reason. Christ says that he is the vine, and the disciples are the branches. But the Catholic does not believe that this was literally a fact. Upon the authority of reason he rejects the literal meaning of Scripture. In so far he is a Rationalist. The Protestant, on the strength of reason, rejects the literal meaning of Christ's assertion, "This is my body." It is a first principle of reason and common sense, that nothing can be at the same time itself and something else. So the Unitarian rejects the doctrine of the Trinity, not only because it is not found in the Scriptures, but because reason teaches that it is a metaphysical and a mathematical impossibility. Three persons, who are each and all identical with one and the same Being, must be identical with each other. If the doctrines of the Bible were made up of such contradictions and inconsistencies, it would be impossible for the human mind to receive it as containing a revelation from God. Such rationalism as this is not only legitimate, but necessary. The Church and the world would now have been in a much better condition than they are, if more of such Rationalism had prevailed a long time ago. A proper application of reason to the interpretation of Scripture would have saved us from innumerable difficulties in which the cause of Christianity is now involved.

And now it is wholly useless to think of stopping the



progress of Rationalism. It must run its course, and sweep away every thing which human reason cannot admit, even if it sweeps away the whole; for, as I have already said, reason is the sentinel which God has placed at the entrance of the human mind, to decide what shall be admitted and what shall be shut out.

But then there is another side to this matter. Reason, as the sentinel of the human mind, may overact his part. It is not the duty of a sentinel to shut out every thing. It is as much his duty to suffer that to pass which has a right to go in, as to exclude that which ought not to be permitted to enter. God has so constituted the world, and so constructed our minds, that absolute knowledge is not the *only* basis of action. We are obliged to act, not upon certainties alone, but upon *probabilities*. The sphere of absolute knowledge is not very extensive. It is confined to those things for which we have the evidence of the senses, of consciousness, of memory, and of mathematical demonstration. For all beyond this we must rely on another species of evidence, that of probability. This constitutes the region of *faith*. Now it is the especial province of reason to judge of probabilities. In this region lie all the records of the past, and of course, among the rest, the records of revelation. All future events, too, are included in the same category. There is an inconceivable mass of probabilities, which approach so near to certainties, that we act upon them every day as though they were certainties. We should feel ourselves to be ridiculous, absurd, *irrational*, were we to refuse to do so. There are, then, innumerable cases in which it is more irrational to shut out probabilities than to receive them. The case, therefore, may be, that true Rationalism may lead to the *reception* of the supernatural, instead of to its rejection.

Among the records of the past have come down to us the books of the New Testament, containing accounts of the supernatural. They contain, too, intermingled with the miraculous, accounts of the natural and historical, which bear the impress of truth and reality so strongly, that no man can deny them without casting aside all history, and launching forth into the sea of universal skepticism. The historical and the natural, which cannot be denied, prove beyond question the belief of those



who could not but have known the truth in the actual occurrence of the supernatural. Is it most rational to believe that these witnesses were deceived, or that the supernatural actually took place? That is the question.

But there is nothing new or startling in all this. There is no new difficulty discovered, unknown to all former generations, no new argument, unthought of and unanswered by those who have gone before us. The deism of Paulus and Bauer and Strauss is no stranger than the deism of Hobbes, Wollaston, and Tom Paine, and the speculations of Kant and Hegel can never be half as dangerous in this country as those of Hume and Gibbon. In fact, the skepticism we get from Germany is nothing more than the English skepticism of the last century filtered through the mud, or distorted by the idealism, of German metaphysics.

Let Rationalism, then, go on and do its work. It doubtless has its mission in the arrangements of Providence. Let it examine the whole subject of religion and the Bible anew. Such a storm will purify the whole theological atmosphere. It is time that this matter were searched into by the light of the nineteenth century. What is sound will be retained, what is unsound or extraneous will be cast away. Let Christianity be cross-examined by its enemies, and if there is truth in it, it will come out. Let Rationalism dig about the foundations of Christianity as much as it pleases, it will soon come down to the solid, living, everlasting rock of Christ, — his history, his character, his teaching. Taking the record as it is, and the events as they are related, some men have thought that nothing could explain them but the supposition that Jesus was Jehovah himself come down out of heaven. It is difficult to conceive that any considerable number will ever acquiesce in a hypothesis which makes him somewhat less than a wise and good man. Let every possible view of the Scriptures be stated and tried, and if there be any capacity in the human mind to perceive and appreciate the truth, the truth will be discovered and embraced; and if there be no such power, then it matters not much what opinions prevail in the world.

And what is Transcendentalism, that the theological scholar should be deterred by it from a thorough investi-



gation of religion and the Bible? As applied to our faith, it amounts to this,—that Christianity is nothing more nor less than a particular development of natural religion,—that every human mind and heart contain in their own elements all there is in Christianity, and a great deal more,—that the idea of a special revelation carries absurdity on the very face of it; that the mind has faculties to receive knowledge only according to the natural laws of its own operations, and that, of course, knowledge supernaturally conveyed cannot be received nor comprehended nor mingled with knowledge derived from other sources,—it cannot be assured to another person, nor made the basis of speculation, action, or expectation. In short, revelation would be an anomaly, standing abstract and alone, inapplicable to life and useless to mankind. Moreover, it cannot be essential to man as a religious being, or it would have been communicated to all.

Those who advocate this view of things are continually discoursing to us about *intuition*,—a mode of obtaining knowledge more immediate, accurate, and unerring than any other, whose special object is the *absolute*. Let us analyze this phraseology, and see whether there be any thing new, important, or enlightening in it. Intuition, if it mean any thing to the purpose, must mean *certain knowledge*. Intuition, if it be an essential power of the human mind, must be *universal*. If this intuition extend to the essential matters of religion, it must of course render revelation unnecessary. But, to answer this description, it must be the same in all, and produce a uniformity of religious belief all the world over. Is there such a uniformity of belief, even in regard to the fundamental principle of all religion,—the unity of God? And if intuition has failed in this most important particular, then it fails of being that which is claimed for it,—an infallible guide in religious matters.

Let us add another word to the somewhat unintelligible phrase, “the absolute,” and say, the *absolute truth*, and much imposing mystery will be dissipated, and we shall gain a clear, though a very common and useful idea. Absolute truth necessarily exists, but it is known to the mind of God alone. All other minds possess only an approximation to it, and only so far as it has pleased God to communicate it to them. And for that approxi-



mation to truth, they have only the evidence of probability, not of certainty. God alone has the evidence of certainty. To man, then, the absolute has no existence. It exists only to God. That the convictions which exist in the human mind relative to religion do not come within the province of the absolute, is sufficiently shown by the fact, that mankind have united in applying to them the term *faith*, that is, something to be *believed*, — to be received upon the authority, not of *absolute knowledge*, but of *probable evidence*.

The province of intuition, or of absolute knowledge, in religious matters, if there be such a province, cannot be very extensive. It cannot go much farther than the single conviction, that there is a difference between right and wrong. This conviction has the mark of being an intuition that it is universal, and cannot be denied. But even here an uncertainty immediately commences, as to what things are to be considered as right and wrong.

But in order to speak wisely, well, and profitably of Transcendentalism, it is necessary to do it justice. We must acknowledge all there is in it that is good and true. In a certain sense, we are all Transcendentalists. We all acknowledge reason as coördinate with revelation, in making known to us the will of God. We all, at least as many as listen to me to-day, confess to the existence of such a thing as natural religion. It is, in fact, the condition and the basis of revealed religion. No mere words could assure us of the existence of a God, were there not a creation and a providence to make him known. The Bible itself has a transcendental element in it. It does not profess to be the only means of knowing God, or of ascertaining his character and will. It makes human reason to be coördinate with itself as the means of Divine manifestation. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." The Apostle declares, — "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." Our Saviour says, — "Even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?" The Apostle says in another place, — "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest,



whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." The definition of a righteous man before God, given in the Old Testament, is, "one that has done that which is lawful and *right*." All this is, to a certain extent, transcendental; that is to say, it appeals to the intuition in man, if there be any such thing as intuition, and makes it of equal authority, as a source of knowledge and guidance, with revelation.

Miracles themselves must be a less and less convincing revelation of God, and proof of his existence and providence, than the grand, the wise, the permanent order and laws of nature which miracles violate. A revelation must be a less manifestation of God's power and wisdom than those faculties, that intellectual and moral constitution, which God has made capable of receiving and comprehending a revelation. It is a much greater work for God to give us being, and a world to live in, than a book to live by. All preaching is, in a certain sense, transcendental. Every preacher speaks, not only from the inspiration of the Bible, but from that inspiration which giveth all men understanding. He deems it his duty to communicate all the moral and religious truth that he knows. He does not stop to inquire whether he derived it from the language of the Scriptures,—from the writings of those men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,—or from his own meditations upon them, or from profane literature, or from his own experience. It is sufficient for him that he knows it, or thinks it, to be truth. Every thing that is true and practical is important, let the knowledge of it come from what source it may.

All listeners to preaching are more or less transcendental, for they receive into their minds that which seems to them to be true, making little discrimination between that which the preacher derives from the language of Scripture, and that which he suggests from his own mind. But both preachers and hearers pay this homage to the inspiration of the Scriptures, that they both confess that the most common and universal truths are better expressed in the Scriptures than they are anywhere else.

The hymns that are sung in our churches are tran-



scendental, inasmuch as the sentiments expressed in them, and adopted by the worshipper, are not exclusively derived from the Scriptures, but are derived from the experience, the emotions, and the reflections of Christians of modern times, since the days of miraculous suggestion are passed. But even the history of sacred poetry bears strong testimony to the supernatural character of the New Testament. We see a constant advancement in moral elevation and in doctrinal purity from the first to the present hour. Yet no one will say, that the best of our hymns transcend, or even equal, the New Testament. That must have been of supernatural origin which rose so far above the moral level of the world, as it then was, that eighteen hundred years of advancement have not yet lifted up the most exalted minds to the same level, though in the enjoyment of all the influences of the Scriptures themselves, in addition to that inspiration which speaks in every mind and heart.

All interpretation of the Bible is in a measure transcendental. On the strength of that inspiration which giveth all men understanding, the expositor of the Scriptures undertakes to say what the words of revelation can and cannot mean. He comes to such a passage as this, — "If any man come unto me, and hate not his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple," — and he decides that the literal meaning cannot be the true meaning. He has such a trust in his own moral sense, that he feels justified in rejecting the literal meaning of Scripture, and in putting a meaning on it which will harmonize with the revelation which God has previously made to every human heart. I have said, that the Bible is transcendental, because it refers to the reason and moral sense of mankind as coördinate with itself, as an expression of the Divine will. It is so for another and stronger reason. Most Christians read the Bible only in translation. Revelation did not form and give meaning to the words in which a common Christian reads the Bible. Those words were formed by the reason, the moral sense, and the religious convictions of uninspired men, and can express the meaning of revelation only so far as they are coincident with it. The language in which the New Testament was written was formed by half-civilized men



on the islands and the shores of Greece, and yet all the sublime teachings of Christ are conveyed to us in the words invented beyond the reach of supernatural illumination. This fact alone is sufficient demonstration that natural revelation is coincident with supernatural, as far as it goes, and that what is called revelation consists in a higher development, a clearer statement, and an authoritative promulgation, of those truths of which all mankind have an imperfect apprehension, and a conviction clouded by more or less doubt.

But having made these concessions to the Transcendentalist, here I stop. I cannot go on with him to assert, that the unaided powers of man produced the Bible just as it is. I refuse to adopt his hypothesis, because in my judgment the Bible transcends Transcendentalism itself. It is admitted that Christ taught the absolute religion. Is not this a transcendental fact? Does it not go beyond all the recorded achievements of unaided humanity? This is acknowledged on all hands. How are we to account for it? Christ himself, who must have known the facts of the case, declares that he was supernaturally aided by God. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave a commandment what I should say and what I should speak." In a solemn prayer to God he said,—"I have given them the words which thou gavest me." Here is certainly an adequate cause assigned, by him who best knew, of the transcendent wisdom of the Saviour. There is certainly nothing absurd, nothing contradictory, and, to my mind, nothing irrational, in the account which Jesus gives of the source of his doctrines.

All knowledge comes ultimately from God. Every operation of our minds is superintended by him. His omnipresent energy sustains the power of thought each moment. Our minds are as accessible to his immediate action, as they are to that which he exercises through second causes. If God exists, and has knowledge and a will, it is as easy for him to communicate to the mind a certain knowledge of his existence, his will and purposes to man, as to give us a certain knowledge of each other through the senses. He may make that which is to us now *faith* to become *certain knowledge*. And this



is precisely the knowledge which Christ professed miraculously to possess. "We speak that *we do know*, and testify that we have seen." "The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Christ's whole conduct was in keeping with this profession. He assumed and sustained the bearing and dignity of an especial messenger from God, the authorized teacher of mankind. If we may believe Christ's assertion, that which to us seems *probable* to him was *certain*. There is no way, that I can see, in which he can be brought down to our level, but by impeaching his veracity, or denying his wisdom, or casting doubt on the historic verity of his life. There is no way of exalting us to a level with him, without bridging over the chasm which in our minds separates the *probable* from the *certain*. There is no phraseology of intuitions, or the absolute, or any other metaphysical mysticism, of which such a bridge can be constructed.

The great question between the Transcendentalist and the Supernaturalist, the Deist and the Christian, is this: — Did Jesus know any thing of God and of the realities of the spiritual world, in a sense which made them absolutely certain, or are his sayings mere probabilities, and of course only his *opinions*? In the one case, we have *doctrines* to be taught upon authority, and in the other, only mere *speculations*, to be accepted or rejected as each one sees fit.

Is there any thing, then, in Transcendentalism so exceedingly dangerous, that the Christian minister is to be deterred by it from the study of the Bible? I, for one, think its danger has been greatly overrated. It has not in this country as yet obtained a logical statement, much less a logical defence. It has not as yet solved its first problem. It professes to discard the miraculous from the New Testament as unhistoric, yet receives much of it as true and authentic. In order to define its position, and have a distinct, substantive existence, it must carry out its analysis, and tell us what we are to accept and what we are to reject. It must give us an expurgated Gospel, or the Gospel according to Transcendentalism. Thomas Jefferson proposed this work to himself, to "sift apart," to use his phraseology, the historic from the unhistoric parts of the New Testament, as an employment



for some of his leisure hours. He afterwards had abundance of leisure, but the thing was never done. Strauss attempted this feat in Germany, but his work by all parties was acknowledged to be a failure. In this country, as yet, we have had no clear statement of the Transcendental hypothesis, no reasoning about it, but merely a rhapsodical declamation here and there, about as conclusive as Burke's ironical argument against all the institutions of civil society. Some few have been blinded for a while by a cloudy mysticism, or dazzled by a brilliant rhetoric, into an admiration for they could not tell exactly what; but most of them have been brought to their senses again by the calm, deep wisdom, the stainless integrity, the tender love, the unaffected piety, and the awful majesty of Jesus of Nazareth.

Hitherto the blows of Transcendentalism have told, not on Christianity, but on Protestantism. Deism can sustain no church. It never built a church, and never can. It requires faith to build churches. If it could get possession of all Protestant churches to-morrow, it would only be to hand them over to the Church of Rome, and make her the grave, as she has been the womb, of all Protestant denominations.

But is Transcendentalism an unmixed evil? Is it merely destructive in its tendencies? Has it no mission for good in the arrangements of Providence? It may be, I believe, under wise management, made to exert a corrective and conservative influence upon Christianity and the Church. Being itself an extravagance, it may operate to correct an opposite extravagance, which has been too prevalent in the Christian world,—an idolatry of the Bible and a contempt for man. For certainly there is a wide difference between believing that man made the Bible, and that the Bible is necessary to create man. It is equally extravagant to maintain that there is nothing divine in man, and to maintain that there is nothing human in the Bible. Equal mischief follows from making too much or too little of the Scriptures, and it is as fatal to religion and morality to make man a deity as a devil. The truth must lie between these two extremes, and perhaps it is necessary for the human mind to vibrate like a pendulum between the two for a while before it will settle in the truth. If the two extremes could



be brought to discuss the subject calmly and dispassionately together, they might mutually correct each other's errors, and the world be edified by the controversy. This, however, in the present state of feeling, cannot be, and the task of reconciliation falls on us, who imagine that we occupy the true and middle ground.

Superadded to these momentous questions, which are coming up among Protestants, and between Protestants and Deists, there are the fundamental questions between Protestants and the Church of Rome. Immense immigration is daily giving an importance to the Catholic Church in this country, wholly unanticipated by our ancestors. There are, and always have been, men in that Church of great learning, intellectual acuteness, and dialectic dexterity. Their literary enterprise and activity have been greatly quickened by a migration to this country of railroads, steam-engines, and telegraphs. And there is no antagonist who makes so strong a draught on the theological attainments of his adversary, as a well-trained and truly learned Catholic. Under these circumstances, is it safe for us to suffer theology to decline among us? Is there any way in which we can so effectually break our force, and render ourselves impotent and insignificant? We must be, for a long time to come, from the very position we occupy, a church militant. A thorough theological training, kept up through life, will be to us just what weapons and discipline are to an army. They make us superior to multitudes without them. If we abandon them, we ourselves become an easy prey. Whatever may be thought in this good city of Boston, the controversial age of our denomination is by no means passed. That we enjoy comparative peace, we owe entirely to the fact of our comparative numerical insignificance. The word is passed from time to time, all over the country, that Unitarianism is dying out, and it is thought hardly worth while to reason down or to write down a denomination which never gets up. Any rapid growth on our part would cause a reaction against us as fierce and bitter as that which created the Inquisition.

I end, then, as I began, by commending the study of systematic theology, as demanded of us especially, by our position, and by the wants of the age. It is the only



thing that can give us, as individuals and as a denomination, strength, assurance, and influence. It is the only thing which can give us the control we ought to exercise over the opinions and the character of this great country in the coming ages, when this vast continent shall be overspread by a population as dense as Asia, and the English tongue shall be spoken by more millions than ever were united by one language under heaven.

---

ART. II. — MAHOMET THE PROPHET OF ARABIA, AND  
BONIFACE THE APOSTLE OF GERMANY.\*

THE appearance of the two works whose titles we give below has revived the interest excited a few years ago, by Carlyle's brilliant Lecture, in the career of the Arabian prophet. Heretofore, our best available authorities have been a brief but well-written sketch in the Family Library "History of Arabia," and Bush's "Life of Mohammed," a rather feeble and unsatisfactory volume of the same series. Gibbon's chapter is too condensed to be properly biographical, though bearing abundant marks of his strong hand as an historian, and of his assiduous muck-rake as annotator; and the old-fashioned libels of Prideaux, and others of that school, are of service only as curiosities.

The field was clearly open for a fresh popular narrative, such as Mr. Irving has undertaken to give. The public judgment decides that he has done it acceptably and well. He has made faithful use, not only of the sources open to him in Spain, but of other recent contributions to the literature of the subject. But we are inclined to join in the disappointment which has been elsewhere expressed, "that no fresh circumstances are brought to light, which are weighty enough to form the cardinal points of a new estimate of Mohammed's char-

---

\* 1. *Mahomet and his Successors.* By WASHINGTON IRVING. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1850. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 373, 500.

2. *The Life and Religion of Mohammed, as contained in the Sheeah Traditions of the Hyât-ul-Kuloob.* Translated from the Persian, by JAMES L. MERRICK. Boston: Phillips & Sampson. 1850. 8vo. pp. 483.



acter and position."\* A large addition has been made to the stores of personal anecdote. The fabulous parts of the narrative are selected and introduced with great felicity. A few chapters of pleasant gossip have been added. The group of the companions and successors of the Prophet has been drawn in altogether new distinctness of color and outline. But one finds comparatively little of substantial value in the new material so industriously gathered. The characteristic merit of the work is from other qualities than that of vigor in conception, or suggestiveness of thought. In the second volume, especially, it has struck us that the author was encumbered with his materials; and we miss such things as we find in the bold, rapid narrative of Gibbon, or the filling out of the sketch offered in a chapter of Sismondi or in a paragraph of Carlyle. One regrets, too, that the account stops short of the most interesting period. For a good history of the Spanish conquest we must still wait. None that we have seen is fully worthy of the subject. And we shall look impatiently for the third volume, which Mr. Irving has intimated he may yet prepare, covering a region and a period peculiarly his own.

As the value of Mr. Irving's work is popular, so that of Mr. Merrick's is literary and scholastical. It is a sort of abridged Mahometan Talmud, with all the garniture of fable which Eastern fancy and superstition have heaped upon the plain story of the Prophet. It is a schedule of mythical curiosities, containing the most singular and out-of-the-way scraps of information, and the most astonishing array of marvels. No less than fifty detailed miracles are enumerated gravely in a single list; and seven such lists make up the contents of a single chapter. History becomes as wavering and fantastical as the dreams of the Arabian Nights. There is a sober, statistical manner in relating the overwhelming array of prodigies, and a placid unconsciousness of irony or scandal in adopting what looks like the grossest style of satiric humor, quite refreshing by way of contrast to the rationalistic and ethical habits so pertinacious in the Western mind. The work has served us only very incidentally, and we are of course

---

\* Prospective Review, Vol. II. p. 165, in an article on Dr. Weil's "*Mohammed der Prophet*,"—a work (which Mr. Irving has both used and cited) containing the results of the most recent and thorough researches.



unprepared to say any thing critically of its merit. A recent notice in this journal makes any such criticism the less needed. With these two books before us, together with a very convenient and fully annotated reprint of Sale's Koran, recently published in Philadelphia, we have, in a convenient form, what we most require for a study of the two sides of Mahomet's career,—as affecting the destinies of the West, and the intellect of the East.

Our present plan leads us to look wholly at the former. Our purpose is to sketch briefly those events by which the Saracen invasion connects itself with the history of Christian Europe; and in so doing we shall use these authorities, and any thing else on which we can lay our hands. The period we are to review is that assigned as the end of the first, and the beginning of the second division of the Middle Ages. The time of barbarian conquest was over; that of concentration and reorganization was just beginning. It was a time when the Christian world rallied its strength, and stood upon the defensive. The mighty struggle began then, which was renewed in the great "defensive" campaigns of the Crusaders, continued in the fifteenth century at Constantinople, and in the seventeenth on the plains of Hungary, and may be presently terminated in the final extinction of the Ottoman power. It was one of the critical periods in the destinies of Europe. The great Christian organization, having its centre in Rome, suddenly developed an unsuspected strength; and the imminent perils of the time were its providential opportunity.

This period almost precisely spans the interval between two events of capital importance, in ecclesiastical history. The conversion of the Saxons in England, begun under Gregory the Great by Augustine, and that of the German tribes, completed under Zachary by Boniface, a hundred and fifty years later, were the two greatest triumphs of the Roman Church in Western Europe. England and Germany, those great and kindred nations, most forward afterwards to declare their independence at the era of the Reformation, were at first the most loyal and submissive of all to the central authority at Rome. Others were sister-churches, and in some sense equal. That was a voluntary homage which they paid to Rome; and they would often act in the spirit of a cer-



tain national independence. These were daughter-churches, and acknowledged the duty of obedience. The archbishops of England were appointed by the Roman pontiff; and the first oath of allegiance taken to him as spiritual sovereign was by the martyr-apostle of Germany. Some of the most important facts of modern history resulted from this position of things. The rise of the Papal power, as one of the great state powers, dates from about this time. It was in part the growth of causes whose discussion belongs to an earlier chapter of the Christian annals; but its rapid ripening, and the great prominence henceforth assumed by it, are to be ascribed to many things working together at the period we are about to review. Of these the chief causes ecclesiastically were those just named; the chief politically were the Saracen invasion, threatening Europe on the east and west, together with the firm stand taken and the important position gained by Charles Martel, chief of the Franks and champion of Christendom.

When Gregory the Great had been dead five years (A. D. 609), Mahomet, then forty years old, began to give himself out for a prophet of God. Gaining at first for disciples only his wife and a few personal friends, rejected, ridiculed, persecuted, for thirteen years, and finally forced to fly for his life, this extraordinary man, by ten years more of fervid preaching and military campaigns, succeeded in binding those wild desert tribes together in the league of an invincible and enthusiastic faith. And when he died (A. D. 632), that faith was on the eve of the most sudden and astonishing career of conquest ever known.

The religion of Mahomet, looked at critically, is a curious compound of local traditions and superstitions, with stray fragments gathered from Christians and Jews. The Koran embodies, in its own fashion, a handsome share of the narrative of both dispensations, including the apocryphal traditions of the "Infancy." Arabia, to a great portion of mankind, is holy ground. In the northwest stands Mount Sinai, its rugged summit scorched and blackened by the awful presence of Jehovah. The rock where, at the word of Moses, water gushed forth for his fainting people,—the well Zemzem, which the angel showed to Hagar when their great fore-



father, Ishmael, was perishing with thirst,—the holy stone, which they say came down from heaven,—are visited and pointed out with devout reverence by the Arab tribes. The simple theism of the patriarchal times had become blended with numerous gross and hostile superstitions. The Kaaba, in the sacred city Mecca, still gathered the people, as of old, to its accustomed rites; but its three hundred and sixty idols were so many monuments of the conflicting elements in the popular faith, which alienated the tribes from the spirit of the ancient time, and made them strangers and enemies to one another.

Among them Mahomet came in the character of a religious reformer. For a whole month each year, during fifteen years, he had been accustomed to dwell alone in a mountain cave, where he fed his fancy with dreams and visions, and nurtured that mystic enthusiasm which was part of his native temperament. And it is by no means hard to suppose that he may have interpreted his own fancies, stimulated by prayer and the action of a heated, perhaps distempered, brain,\* into a real commission from Heaven to oppose the rude idolatry of the time, and declare the doctrine of one only God. He was gifted with an enthusiastic and burning eloquence, which with the Arabs passes for a divine gift. "No mortal man," they think, "unless inspired, could wield the vast fabric of their language."† And though Mahomet had never learned to read or write, yet what he gave out from time to time as the successive revelations of God was allowed, says Sale, to be unrivalled by any poets or orators in that tongue.

The Koran, at least as transposed into a modern idiom, might seem the product of an ignorant rhapsodical enthusiasm; and, like that, it startles one sometimes with strains of genuine poetry and eloquence. This book was the only miracle which he claimed. The composition of it he defied to be equalled or approached by any human author; angels had tried in vain to produce a single chapter to match its matchless fabric;‡ and it remains to this day an open question among the faithful,

---

\* Mr. Irving (Vol. I. p. 61) vindicates, after Weil, the old story of his being subject to fits of epilepsy.

† Murphy, Mohammedan Empire in Spain.

‡ Life and Religion, p. 108.



whether that stupendous production has an absolute self-existence, "very light of very light," or whether it was only created before every creature, and deposited in the lower heavens to be revealed in its time.

To all threats and opposition the new prophet had but one reply. "Though the sun should stand on my right hand, and the moon on my left, and command me to desist, yet I serve a higher than the sun and moon, and will not hear them." "What are your gods," said he to the idolaters, "but stocks of black wood? They are dumb and blind. Smear them with wax, and the flies stick to them. Can these gods help you?" And once, when flying for his life with a single companion, who trembled because they were only two, "You forget," said he, "there is a third with us, God, who is stronger than they all." This fervid religious fanaticism was a chief element of his success. And there were two things beside (characteristic of every skilful leader of men) which added very much to his motive power,—his humoring as he did the temper of the men he had to deal with, and the occasion which he found in the religious and political condition of the neighbouring states.

The first rested partly on the skilful use which he made of the doctrine of predestination, — the belief, it is said, of every earnest and headstrong race. The vague faith he found ready to his hand. His skill was in the direction he gave to it. Each man's *death*, he taught, is written down, — the day and hour, — so that none can possibly escape. Man's freedom is only to choose the worthiest way to die. Those who fell in battle would have perished just the same, at business abroad, or in bed at home; but basely before, most gloriously now. It was their privilege and blessing to have fallen in battle. They were already in the joys of paradise. The time of persecution over, he turned the sword at once against his persecutors, and his became a military faith. Before, he had said, "Bear opposition with patience; be not grieved with unbelievers; let there be no violence in religion." Now it was, "War is enjoined on you against the infidels. Fight, then, against the friends of Satan. Kill the idolaters wherever ye find them; take them prisoners; lay siege to them; lie in wait for them in every convenient place. The sword is the key



of heaven and hell. A drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer." "The march is hot," said he, when his soldiers faltered in the desert, "but hell is hotter."\* "The Koran, tribute, or the sword," were the short and sharp conditions the Moslem armies always offered. And while the religion enjoins frequent times of devotion, severe fasts, and laborious pilgrimages,—these, too, sometimes whimsically compromised,—it fits itself easily to the excitable, sensual temper of the Eastern people. Its name is Islam,—that is, *submission*: and this may be the foundation of the most indolent acquiescence, as God's subjects, or of the fiercest fanaticism, as his instruments. Its paradise has all the lazy luxury of an Oriental garden or seraglio;† its hell, the palpable mud, and stench, and flame, that make the vulgar imagination of the bottomless pit.‡ Its imagery could be refined and spiritualized by the more thoughtful, who, says Sale, regard it all as symbolical; but it addressed itself directly to popular passion,—the gross fear and hope of the rude mass.

Then the religion of Mahomet found its opportunity in the distractions of the East. The Persians had been wasted and broken up in wars, and their empire offered no long resistance to the Saracen inroad. At Constantinople the strength of Church and state was spent, partly in trying to humble Rome, partly in a most unhappy and disorganizing struggle against religious heresies. A party that would be ultra orthodox had maintained that there was but a single nature in Christ,—the divine; and the Church was long and sharply divided against itself,—a division which was not reconciled by the proposed "amendment," that, though he had two natures, there was only a single will. Nay, the "compromise" (as compromises will) excited another controversy as sharp as the one it was meant to heal; and the heretic party, says Gieseler, were already disposed to accept the Arabian prophet for their deliverer.

---

\* See Koran, *passim*, especially chap. ix., which was the last revealed.

† How charming is the naïve description of the Houris,—“having large black eyes, and resembling the eggs of an ostrich, covered with feathers from the dust”!

‡ Chap. xxxvii., *et al.*



Mahomet had done his best to conciliate both Jews and Christians, in the only way which he knew. The line of prophets before him consisted of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus; and all the Scriptures claim for them he was forward to allow. But the Jews were obstinate, and drew upon themselves his bitterest hate. His first complete conquest was over those of their sect in Arabia. The Christian doctrines, too, as he heard them, seemed gross idolatry. The Trinity in its abstracter form he may not have heard of. As travestied by some of the Eastern sects, it was composed of the Father, Son, and Virgin Mary. The death of Jesus he rejected as an ignominy; and the Mahometans, we are told, hold to this day that it was Judas \* who died upon the cross, while Jesus was carried, like Elijah, into heaven. To the uttermost, however, Mahomet asserted his own high and paramount claim. A false prophet arose and proposed to share the honors. He wrote, "Moseilama, the prophet of God, to Mahomet, the prophet of God: now let half the earth be mine and half thine." The reply was, "Mahomet, the prophet of God, to Moseilama the liar: God shall bestow the earth where he hath chosen." And Moseilama was slain in battle.†

The armies of Mahomet's successors were utterly ignorant of the nations they were going to attack. It was a religious and warlike impulse that drove them on, as instinct drives great buffalo-herds across the prairie. Their summons was short and imperative. Embrace our faith and be our brethren, to share the glory and the spoil: pay tribute, keep your religion in peace, and we defend you: the only other offer is the sword. "We will bring upon you," was their defiance to Jerusalem, ‡ "men who find more delight in death than you in your wine and swine's flesh; and we will not withdraw till God grants us to destroy those of you who fight, and make your children slaves." The military instructions given to the officers in command in Syria were, —

"Remember that you are always in the presence of God, in view of death and judgment, in hope of paradise. Avoid injustice and oppression: consult as brethren: keep the love and

---

\* Or some one else. A list of the supposed substitutes is given in one of the notes to the edition of the Koran already referred to.

† Sale's Introduction, § 8.

‡ Sismon di, *Histoire de la Chute de l'Empire Romain*.



confidence of the troops. When you fight in the Lord's battles, quit you like men : give not back : soil not your victory by women's or children's blood. Destroy not the palms : burn not the wheat : cut not down the fruit-trees : do the flocks no harm, but to kill what you need for food. If you make a treaty, be true to it : let your deed be as your word. When you come to the enemy's country, you will find religious persons who live apart in monasteries, endeavouring to serve God in their way. Kill them not, nor destroy their dwellings. But you will find, too, another sort, who belong to the synagogue of Satan, who have the crown of their head shaven. Give them no quarter, unless they embrace the faith or pay tribute."\*

The first Caliphs lived in Spartan simplicity, every thing being devoted to the furthering of the faith. Omar (whose mosque at Jerusalem was the second in splendor of the Mahometan world †), while his conquests were spreading on every side, was the simple leader of the devotions at Mecca. He was found there by an envoy, sleeping on the stone steps where beggars slept : the staff he leaned on was his bow : and all his equipage, as he rode his single camel to the shrine at Jerusalem, was "a sack of wheat, a basket of dates, a wooden platter, and a water-skin." The treaty, in which he allowed the inhabitants full liberty of worship, he signed sitting on the ground, in a tent of camel's hair. Such were the men whose officers were conquerors of half the world. And when their successors had become the effeminate and capricious Caliphs of Damascus or Bagdad, still the army kept the fierce independence of the desert tribes, and its chiefs the fervid fanaticism of the Moslem faith.

In Mahomet's lifetime, he had exchanged embassies with the emperors of Greece ‡ and Persia. They thought little, doubtless, of the desert prophet, but soon learned to dread the assault of his disciples. Within two years after his death, Damascus, the oldest city in the world, was taken ; and Jerusalem three years later. Within twenty years, Persia was completely subdued, and the Arabs came to dwell on the Tigris and Euphrates, — spreading thence their faith by missionaries in India and the farthest East, and crushing the old fire-worship of

---

\* Perhaps a reminiscence of Mahomet's old interest in the controversies among the Christian monks.

† Second only to that at Cordova, says Mr. Irving.

‡ "Herkul, emperor of Room," as he is called by the "Hyât-ul-Kuloob."



Iran. Constantinople was twice beleaguered by an Arab fleet; and twice was saved by the timely and terrible defence of the unquenchable Greek fire.

Meanwhile the conquest spread westward, like flame in stubble. Amru, the boldest and most ambitious of the Moslem chiefs, undertook the conquest of Egypt, — the strange land they had so often heard of in their traditions of Abraham and Joseph.\* Ancient Memphis was supplanted by modern Cairo, — “town of victory,” — lying on the opposite river-bank, towards Arabia and the East. At Alexandria, Amru was taken prisoner, while straying heedlessly from his camp. The Greeks did not suspect his rank (for his garb was mean as the meanest), and when he spoke so haughtily that he might have betrayed himself, his slave struck him on the face, bidding him keep silence before his betters, — then sent him as if for a message to the camp. Escaping so, he led back the charge, and was presently master of the city. It was said that by Omar’s order he burned the great library there, — so great, that it furnished fuel six months to four thousand public baths.†

Akbah carried the conquest farther west, into the distracted states of North Africa, — still rent with the Donatist and Arian feuds, — crushing together Greek and Vandal, and both the rival parties in the Church. The Moorish tribes of Africa, acknowledging their kindred ‡ from the Arabian desert, accepted eagerly their congenial faith; and from the mingling of these two barbarous races, that coast has been called the coast of Barbary to this day. Akbah swept across the whole north shore of Africa, and came as far as the Atlantic, where he spurred his horse into the waves, and, raising his eyes to heaven, said, “Great God, if my course were not stopped by this sea, I would still go on to the unknown kingdoms of the west, preaching the unity of thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other god than thee!”

At this time the kingdom of the Goths in Spain was

---

\* See Koran, chap. xii., and the poem of “Yusuf,” in Ticknor’s History of Spanish Literature, Vol. III., Appendix.

† Mr. Irving hardly hints a doubt of this very doubtful story. He even makes five thousand baths, instead of four.

‡ Bourke, Moors in Spain.



falling into decay. The Goths had lost their bold temper and proud spirit. From the first they had adopted the refinement, and now they yielded to the faith, of Rome. The Roman had prevailed over the Arian belief; and the priesthood already showed something of that cruel bigotry which has always been characteristic of Spain. The Jews were bitterly persecuted, and twenty thousand of them were banished. The Gothic laws concerning slaves were of unexampled cruelty; their institutions, it is said, made the first model of the Inquisition.\* Blinding or assassination had come to be the custom, when one king was succeeded by another. The sovereigns in battle rode in a pompous chariot, with royal robes and a coronet of pearls, as if it were a holiday show and certain victory.

Roderick, "the last of the Goths," was a profligate and cruel man, — his one virtue the cheap and common one of military courage. He was already forewarned, it was said, that his realm must fall. A house in Toledo, capital of Gothic Spain, was kept always locked,† by the mandate of some old prophecy; and at the accession of each king the custom was that he should put on an additional lock, leaving the key with the magistrate. Roderick's jealous avarice was roused; and he not only refused the lock, but ordered the house to be broken open. Nothing was found in it but a chest; and in that chest a scroll, containing the figure of a mounted Arab, and an inscription saying that when that house should be opened, a race of men so featured and equipped should become conquerors of Spain.

Time passed on, and the prophecy was forgotten. The fortress of Tangier, opposite Gibraltar rock, was held by the Count Julian, and kept the Saracens in check. But Roderick cruelly entreated Julian's daughter, and sent her with a mocking message to her father; and to be revenged, he invited over the Moors and Arabs, to invade the country and drive out its unworthy lord.‡ So the king's insolent crime was followed by the

---

\* See Introduction to Southey's "Cid"; also, *Esprit des Loix*, XXVIII. 1, and XXIX. 16.

† Murphy, *Empire in Spain*.

‡ Out of this, Southey has fabricated the garrulous and sentimental story of his "Roderick." Mr. Irving despatches the tradition in a single incredulous allusion.



Moorish Empire in Spain, which for a time put the whole of Christendom in peril. While Christian Europe was given to sterner things, science and philosophy were cultivated by the Arabs. Cordova, their capital, contained a population of a million; it numbered at one time a hundred and fifty authors. The culture of fruits and the growth of silk, with various luxuries, and such Moorish arts as wrought and adorned the gorgeous Alhambra, made it outshine in splendor all other European cities. But the irreconcilable hostilities of religion were the germ of dissension and decay; and the Saracen power was finally extinguished in the conquest of Granada, by Ferdinand and Isabella, in 1492.

Musa, the conqueror of Spain, cherished the gigantic project of sweeping round through Europe, subduing every Christian state in turn, and making the circle of Saracen empire meet about the whole Mediterranean. But he was recalled on suspicion to Damascus; his son was wantonly slain, and the head shown in mockery to the wretched father, who went to end his days in religious exercises at Mecca. The Goths fell back upon the mountainous district of Asturia, close on the Bay of Biscay, and began that obstinate war for their religion, race, and realm, which lasted seven hundred and eighty years; that war which so wrought the virtues and faults of the Spanish people, — their romantic loyalty and dark superstition, — their lofty pride of chivalry, or devotional fervor, and their implacable bigotry towards the enemies of their faith.\* So placed, and so strung to the encounter, they made a partial barrier against that fierce Mahometan assault.

But the great battle for the religion and liberties of Europe was fought on the plains of France. The Goths had still retained from the Franks a portion of its territory, and the Saracens would succeed them there. France began to suffer from their ravage and devastation; and it began to be feared that these children of the desert would make themselves a desert on that soil, and encamp there permanently. They trusted, too, to divisions among the Frankish chiefs. The long-haired and

---

\* Mr. Ticknor has admirably traced the sequence of these results of the Moorish war upon the mind, character, and literature of Spain.



bearded kings, sons of Clovis and Clotaire, had degenerated to a line of imbecile boys, kept immured in the royal house, and only paraded once a year, for some state ceremony, in a car drawn by oxen,—the victims, not the leaders, of the state. The power was wielded by a high officer, called *Mord-dom*,—that is, Judge of Life and Death,\*—afterwards rendered Major-domo, or Mayor of the Palace; and he shared it usually with a colleague or rival. Karl, or Charles, was now the strong man of that race. But jealousies had arisen; he had been kept confined, and was scarcely rescued by his friends; and the chief of the southern country was his foe. So the Saracen, Abdalrahman, hoped to step between and crush them both. But Karl gathered a strong force, and trained them first in the wars of the border tribes. Then he put to them the question (which to the free warriors of the Franks the chief must always put), Shall we go and meet these new invaders? And his men answered with a shout, and were ready for the battle.

And so those two great races met, on the plain near Tours. Asia and Europe, the East and the West, encountered in defiance, face to face. For a week they lay in each other's sight, and only made slight trials of their strength. It was on the seventh day that the Moors made their desperate assault on the iron-clad warriors of the Franks. Their light horse broke upon that barrier, like foam upon a rock. Unmoved and impenetrable the Christians stood, "like a belt of ice," tiring down that idle effort, or mowing the infidels like grain, when within reach of the terrible sweep of their battle-axe. Abdalrahman saw that all was vain, and sought death where the blows were heaviest. Both armies encamped, as before, on the plain. But when, next morning, the Franks had stood long in array, expecting an attack, they sent to view, and behold, the Arab tents were empty. All had fled in the night. From this great victory Karl was named Martel, or the Sledgehammer; "for," said the chronicler, "as the hammer breaks and bruises iron and steel and all other metals, so did he bruise and break in battle all these foes and strange nations." The Arabs, complaining not of destiny, call the fatal field the Mar-

---

\* Sismondi.



tyrs' Pavement; "and to this day," say they, "the sound is heard which the angels of heaven make in so sacred a place, to call the faithful unto prayer." \*

Charles Martel, it has been said, is known to us only through a cloud,—but that a thundercloud. He was more Pagan than Christian,—a man both feared and hated by the Church. His mother's brother had slain at prayer a bishop who spoke slander of her. His own victories he gained by paying his rough troops with the Church's spoil, and the Roman amphitheatre at Nismes, which he tried to destroy by fire, still shows, it is said, the marks of his terrible campaign in the South of France. The Franks, such stanch Christians in the "Merovingian times," had relapsed to something like pagan barbarism. For eighty years, said Boniface, there was no council or archbishop among them. The untamed, unconverted tribes from beyond the Rhine were brought over to swell the armies of Charles. The clergy saw with terror the havoc he made in their fair lands and Church treasuries. But the ills he had wrought, said they, the Lord made to fall back upon his own head; and "St. Euchère, being once at prayer, absorbed in meditation on holy things, was borne into the other world; where, by revelation of the Lord, he saw Charles in torment, in the bottom of hell. When he asked the reason, the angel who was his guide answered, that so the saints had judged him, whose domains he had invaded. Returning to this world, Euchère told the story to Boniface and others, adding for proof, that, if they should go to Charles's tomb, they would not find his body there. They went; but on opening the tomb there came forth a serpent; and the tomb was empty and blackened, as with fire.

This formidable annunciation had great effect with the descendants of Charles Martel, confirming powerfully their alliance with the Church. But with Charles himself it was policy, not superstition, that made him in his latter days a strenuous defender of the Christian faith. As a desperate resource, to fortify himself against the Saracens, he had called in his fierce kindred from beyond the Rhine; and the Church's property was the ransom of

---

\*. Capefigue, Charlemagne.



its life. But the Frieslanders, Saxons, and Allemans coveted the wealth of Gaul, and the stream of them was still unspent. The Franks were first conquerors of that soil, and had encamped themselves thereon, and were now proprietors, with their own towns, castles, and domains. So the strife was long and deadly between them and those who followed in their track. The terrible Saxon campaigns of Charlemagne were only incidents in that great warfare. Hemmed in between the two invasions of Moor and Teuton, Charles had found the Christian his only defence against the Pagan tribes. To spread Christianity was to spread the limits of comparative peace and civilization. To secure his own domain, he required other weapons than the hammer and the sword. He must throw up an outwork against the passion itself of barbarian conquest; fortify affinity of race by kindred of belief; and intrench himself within a breastwork of Christian civilization. And the allies he needed in this new defence were monks and clergy,—the consecrated envoys of the Church.

“Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, was the instrument of this great revolution.” He was an English monk, of the Anglo-Saxon Church; his name, Winfred, changed to Boniface (*well-doer*) at his consecration by the Pope. He was born about 680; and at the age of twenty-three, inspired by a devoted missionary zeal, he had gone among the Frieslanders, the most fierce and disdainful of all the German tribes, to labor for their conversion. “Is it true,” asked one of their chiefs of a priest, when his foot was already in the baptismal font, “that my ancestors, the Frieslanders, are in hell?” “Unquestionably,” replied the priest; “they died without the faith, and could not be heirs of salvation.” “Then,” said the chief, in wrath, “I will not quit those brave men to join the cowardly and base-born of your heavenly kingdom. Take your preaching elsewhere; we will follow the customs of the bold Frieslanders.”\* Such was the untempered stuff the Christian missionaries had to deal with. The priest was solaced on his way by a vision which showed the defiant chief among his ancestors in hell; but there was very little encouragement to be

---

\* Bercestel's (Roman Catholic) History of the Church.



had among the living. Boniface had labored first in the same field; then he went to Rome, where he received a fresh commission from the Pope. The Gallic Church had been speculative, rationalistic, divided, tending overmuch to separation and independence. To meet and win the rude tribes of Germany, it needed a more centralizing influence, and a more imposing name. Christ must be preached "in the name of Rome, that great name which for so many generations had filled their ear." And the first oath of submission and allegiance to the Roman see was taken by Boniface, as he set forth on this perilous expedition, into the depth of the pagan and barbaric world.

He, says Michelet, "was the Columbus and the Cortéz of that unknown world, whither he penetrated with no other weapon than his dauntless faith and the name of Rome." The restless tribes he attached to the soil by the influences of Christian culture. Journeying across the ocean, the Alps, and the Rhine, he became the bond of nations, — the mediator between the Franks and Rome on the one side, and Germany on the other. The Pope, having need of defence against the Lombards, made him his envoy to Charles Martel; sending with him the symbolic keys, "and such gifts as none had seen the like." The hands of the Frank were over-full now; but his son and grandson established that most important alliance, for which Boniface had prepared the way. On the Rhine he erected the church of Mayence, metropolitan of Christian Germany, and became archbishop there. Cologne, "the church of relics, the holy city of the Low Countries," was of his foundation. His school at Fulda, in the heart of Germanic barbarism, "became the light of the West, and the teacher of its masters." He became the vicar of the Pope in that region, and seemed as zealous for the triumph of Rome as of Christianity itself. He founded various monasteries, outposts of Christian influence;\* and sought to regulate men's lives and manners by ecclesiastical rule. The pagan customs of eating horseflesh, bacon, and certain sorts of game (as hares, daws, and storks), he was enjoined by the Pope to forbid

\* The importance of monasteries as agents of civilization may be inferred from the fact, stated by Capefigue, that five eighths of the towns in France were originally monastic settlements.



wholly, or to restrict by penance.\* In return, he asks the Pope's authority to imprison and excommunicate the false teachers who troubled him. — Adelbert, who seems to have been a kind of itinerant enthusiast, preaching by waysides and Druidic (?) fountains, displaying strange relics, "offering prayers in his own name," and revered extravagantly by the people as a saint; and Clement, who held that Christ, when he went below, set free some of the "spirits in prison," — "believers and unbelievers, praisers of God and worshippers of idols, — and many other horrible things, contrary to the Catholic faith." One can pardon the noble missionary's impatience of contradiction, working as he was for what to him was the only saving faith. The submission he demanded of others, he was first of all thoroughly willing to yield himself.

But it was the lofty ideal Church which he cherished and identified with the name of Rome. He dealt frankly and independently by his own conviction. Hearing of scandalous and pagan doings sanctioned even there, at the fountain of authority, he wrote to the Pope: — "These carnal men, these simple Allemans, Boians, and Franks, if they hear of such things at Rome as we forbid, will think it lawful, and be offended. They hear of pagan dances, shouts, and songs, close by the church, at the new year, by day or night; and that one will not lend his neighbour either tool or fire: also that women wear pagan bracelets and phylacteries (flounces?), and sell the same. With these carnal and ignorant people such things are a great hindrance to our doctrine and preaching. If you will prohibit them at Rome, it will be a great gain to you and to us." He asks, in all simplicity, if it is true that the Pope violates the canons, and falls into the sin of simony. "We beg you, dearest brother," returned the Pope, "to say no more about that."

In the year 752, Boniface consummated the alliance between the Church of Rome and the new monarchy of France, by crowning Pepin, father of Charlemagne and son of Charles Martel. That strong-handed family had long wielded the power of the state. They only wanted the sanction of legitimacy to what was already an es-

---

\* Gieseler.



tablished fact; and that Church was the only institution then standing, venerable for age, and of authority in the West. While other institutions had crumbled, while other cities were overthrown and lost, Rome had still kept something of her supremacy. She was still the great, the ancient, the sacred city. Her Church was the fountain-head of religious authority; her bishop was, more than any other, prince and defender of the state. His connection with the Eastern Church and empire had long been weakened. From the first he was, far more than the Eastern primates, an independent ruler, even while nominally subject to the same state authority. He was, says Guizot, "not the servant of a present sovereign, but the vicar of an absent one." This compelled him to act more freely, on his own responsibility. Since the times when Leo had been left to defend the city from the Huns, and Gregory to save it from the Lombards, it was to the Bishop of Rome that the security of Italy was intrusted. Though nominally his choice must be ratified by the Emperor, yet really he was free; and when the sovereign tried to impose on the city a bishop it did not choose, a rebellion of the soldiers warned him not to carry his supposed authority too far. Discords and heresies in the East, and the great Mahometan invasion, which still hung threateningly, crippled the imperial power, year by year. And now, when the Lombards were crowding on the North, and a strong hand was wanting to fortify the position of the Church at Rome, — to keep it safe at home, and back its great enterprises abroad, — the readiest appeal was to the powerful chief of the Franks. The Pope wanted military defence, and the force of arms. The king wanted the prestige of legitimacy, and the force of law. So that equal alliance was established, which in the next generation crushed the Lombard kingdom, making the Pope a temporal prince, and for seven hundred and fifty years secured to the Church of Rome its spiritual supremacy, on the basis of political independence and sovereignty.

This alliance, followed by so momentous consequences, marks the crowning point in the life of Boniface. He was now an old man of seventy-two. In the warm zeal of youth he had begun the great work, to which the energies of his manhood were so thoroughly conse-



crated. For forty years he had been the ambassador of Christ and the Church to the rude tribes that swarmed thick upon the outskirts of civilization. He had been a pioneer and conqueror in that bloodless and glorious campaign. The broad German land was brought into the family of Christian nations. Churches, monasteries, and schools were established, giving the religion a firm hold upon the mind of that barbarous people. He had his reward, in being archbishop and spiritual sovereign in the Christian metropolis he himself had founded, on the banks of the noble Rhine. Four or five great tribes, before hostile and dispersed, revered him as their teacher in knowledge and their guide in faith. He was the agent of the great spiritual dominion at Rome, and of the strong monarchy of the Franks,—perhaps more widely and deeply powerful than any other man then living. And now, it seemed, he had only to thank God for what had been accomplished, and spend the latter days of his life in peace.

But the fire of his early zeal still burned in him undimmed, and he felt that there was still work in store for him. The Frieslanders, the fiercest and rudest of the tribes for which he had spent his life, who had scorned his mission and repulsed him fifty years before, were still unconverted, as they were always unsubdued. This cloud of Pagan darkness rested on the border of his Christian realm; and to dispel it must be the last effort of his life. So he besought the Pope to accept the surrender of his church dignity, and commission him afresh to his missionary work. Another was appointed archbishop in his place; and Boniface, whose higher dignity was as Apostle to the Germans, went forth again as simple pioneer of the faith. He had already been employed in restoring more than thirty churches, which the inconstant barbarians had destroyed by fire. His head was clear, and his heart strong; but this expedition he felt would be his last. “Know, my son,” said he to his successor, “that the time of my death draws near. Hear your father’s last request. Go on with the building of the churches I have begun in Thuringia; labor with all zeal for the conversion of the tribes; finish the church at Fulda, and when my time has come bury me there. And, that nothing may be wanting, do not forget with



my books to send a winding-sheet." And with these words the old man left him weeping.\*

Coming into the Low Countries on the Rhine, he labored with such effectual zeal, that, as the account is, "he baptized the infidels by thousands, made them throw down their temples and build churches in their stead, and appointed a day for their confirmation; meanwhile sending each to his own home." His dwelling was on the river-side, where people thronged to him, as to John in the wilderness, to be baptized. On the appointed day, instead of the disciples he was looking for, appeared a turbulent band of armed barbarians, who fell upon his encampment. His servants were eager to beat them back; but he said, "Lay down your arms, my children; our religion bids us not render evil for evil. The day I have longed for is come. Trust in God, and for a few moments of this poor life he shall give you an everlasting kingdom." Then the pagans fell upon them, and slaughtered them, to the number of fifty-two. So died Boniface, seventy-five years old, — the noblest of the early missionaries of the Church. His death, it was said, was presently revenged by a Christian army; and it was not long before the remnant of the tribe were ready to embrace his faith.

The interval of a hundred and twenty-three years separates the death of the warrior-prophet of Arabia from that of the martyr-apostle of Germany. That interval is the period of the highest glory to the Saracen invaders in Mahomet's name, and of the deepest debasement (as is generally reckoned) to the mind of Europe. But in the almost utter absence of history, poetry, or science, there was yet the element of religious conviction, and an organizing force living enough and strong enough to lay the foundation of the European family of states: and to these a new career of freedom and intellectual activity is opening, while the Mahometan dominion is but a relic, decaying and frail, of that mighty power established by the sudden and fierce assault of a conquering horde. It is no purpose of ours to draw a parallel between either the religion or the polity of Mahometan and Christian nations; but we mark this single fact.

---

\* Bercastel.



The thought and heart of the Moslem movement were all in one man, — his best gift a poetic and devout enthusiasm, — his mind untrained, his passions to the uttermost indulged; — a man, save in the marvellous blending of fanatic fervor and invincible will, far inferior to the least among many who have given nobility to the Christian name. The two religions are no fair subject for comparison, in this sort, perhaps; indeed, one has often been treated as an offshoot or distortion of the other, rather than as strictly an independent faith. But when we think of the sudden conquest of the one, and the slow-maturing, long-enduring dominion of the other, we should not forget to do honor to those obscure but noble men, whose patient toils, so full of fruit for us (for we are also of the Teutons), are almost lost in the glare that lights up the story of the Arabian Prophet and his successors.

J. H. A.

---

ART. III. — THE ORIGIN OF THE MINISTRY AT LARGE,  
AND ITS FREE CHAPELS.\*

WE have never read a Report of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches with more pleasure than we derived from the perusal of the last. It is full of valuable information, and to every one interested in the moral condition of the poor in our cities, we would recommend its careful perusal. We are happy to learn from it the good which has resulted from the labors of those faithful ministers, which cannot but continue whilst the same devotedness and Christian spirit shall characterize their efforts, which are so conspicuous in this Report. Our faith will never waver in the onward prosperity and success of this ministry, so long as it shall be carried on in the same spirit, and shall continue to rely for success on that Christian principle in which it had its origin, — preaching the Gospel to the poor.

Whilst reading this Report, we have been forcibly re-

---

\* *The Sixteenth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches.* Boston: J. Wilson. 8vo. pp. 36.



mind of the small beginnings in which this noble work of philanthropy had its origin, and the remarkable success which has attended its progress. The readers of this journal have been wont to meet in its pages, during the last score of years, with occasional mention of the Ministry at Large in Boston, of its purposes, its efficient agents, and its effects. Notwithstanding the multitude of pamphlets and reports which it has called forth, and the many sketches of the labors of Dr. Tuckerman and others in this work, there are some very interesting facts connected with its "day of small things," that have not as yet found their way into print, in a connected form.

In tracing out the history of this ministry, not long since, in our memory and from records, we found that in September, 1822, two young men were quite desirous that a Sunday school should be formed in a new school-house, then in process of erection, at the north part of the city. So interested did they become in the matter, that they called together some friends, made known their hopes and plans, and urged that some measures should be taken to carry them into effect. The first meeting was held in October, 1822, at which four persons only were present. On the suggestion of the plan, various religious topics were introduced. At an adjourned meeting, a committee was chosen to report some more specific plan to the meeting which was to be held the ensuing week. Such a meeting was held, and several others like it, but nothing more was accomplished; and although several gentlemen came together, who it was thought would greatly assist in promoting the excellent objects contemplated, especially that of the religious instruction of the poor, yet the brief records of two meetings at that time mention, "that they did not hold out much encouragement of success." And it is well remembered by us, that, whilst the subject was under consideration, one of the gentlemen, who was much interested in the matter, almost discouraged, left the room, and remarked, that he despaired of success. But the cloud passed away, and at a meeting not long after an association was formed, under the name of the "Association of Young Men for Mutual Improvement and the Religious Instruction of the Poor." The first of these objects the members aimed to accomplish by meeting on



one evening in every week, when some subject was discussed, or plan for the improvement of the poor considered. The latter object was to be effected by the establishment of Sunday schools, and by means of lectures in different parts of the city, on Sunday evening, at the dwellings of the poor.

The meetings of the Association soon became quite interesting and profitable, and it was not long before an opportunity offered by which its members were enabled to carry their second plan into operation. It was suggested by some of the members, that a place should be provided for preaching to the poor who were prevented from attending public worship. Rev. Henry Ware, who was much interested in the Association from its commencement, kindly offered to furnish preaching when a suitable place should be found. A room was soon obtained in an old dilapidated building in Hatters' Square, which was filled with poor families. On the second story, at the head of the stairs, was a chamber occupied by a most excellent woman, whose husband was absent at sea. On Sunday evening, November 24th, 1822, the floor having been neatly sanded, a small stand with a Bible upon it was seen in one corner, and some dozen chairs were placed around. In the evening the neighbours assembled, and soon after the Rev. Henry Ware, accompanied by two members of the Association, were seated in that humble room. The text of the sermon preached was from Matthew xxii. 37, 38, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great commandment."

In this first Sunday-evening service held for the religious instruction of the poor, in this humble manner, we have the commencement of the Ministry at Large in the city of Boston, more than twenty-seven years ago. Small as was the audience, it was encouraging to the members of the Association, and the next Sunday evening they held a similar meeting in a small room in Charter Street, and three weeks after a service was held in Hatters' Square, Charter Street, and Spring Street. Neither congregation exceeded twenty-five in number. These services were continued till the following June. They were well attended by the persons for whom they were designed, and often the audience, small as it was,



presented a most touching sight. Much good was done by these evening exercises in the parts of the city where they were held, and many among the poor have expressed very grateful thanks for the influence they exerted upon them and their families.

In January, 1823, the subject of obtaining some one as a minister to the poor was considered in the Association, and a committee was appointed to procure the services of some suitable person. A committee was also chosen, to ascertain if a lot of land could not be found for the erection of a free chapel. Much progress was not made by this committee, great difficulties being found in the way of procuring a suitable person.

In the autumn of 1824, efforts were made by the Association to resume the Sunday-evening lectures. During this winter they were conducted by the members of the Association in a room in Pitts Court. They were well attended, and the audience seemed much interested.

In February, 1824, another effort was made to obtain a minister and erect a chapel, which was attended with little success. From this time, the Association held its meetings every week, and among other subjects presented for consideration were the mission to India, the condition of our prisons, temperance, peace, the formation of the American Unitarian Association, and the distribution of religious publications. Each of these topics was fully discussed, and its members took an active part afterwards in the formation of societies which had these objects specially in view. Thus the work went on, the Association simply holding its meetings weekly, from the autumn of 1824, to November, 1826, when information was received that the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, who had been pastor of the church in Chelsea for twenty-five years, had become much interested in the poor of our cities, and had expressed a desire to meet the members of the Association. Accordingly, on the following Wednesday evening, November 5th, 1826, Dr. Tuckerman met its members for the first time. It was a full meeting, and all seemed animated with fresh courage. A committee was chosen to procure a place for him in which he might preach, and the means for carrying out his plans as a minister to the poor.

A large room, at the corner of Merrimac and Portland



Streets, was procured, and Sunday-evening lectures were commenced. This place, prepared for religious services, was in the upper chamber of what was called the Circular Building. Suitable seats having been procured, worship was held under the naked beams, surrounded by bare brick walls. On Sunday evening, December 2d, 1826, Dr. Tuckerman preached the first sermon in this humble place, and thus commenced his services as a Minister at Large. Arrangements were immediately made to form a Sunday school, which was commenced on a very cold day in December. It was cheerless, indeed, as one has well said who was present on that day, as the winter's wind came whistling through the loose casements, and the windows were covered with a thick coat of frost, whilst around a small stove were gathered *three* children and seven teachers. Those, however, who were engaged in this good work were not easily discouraged. They persevered, and in a short time had an interesting school, and some of them afterwards had the pleasure of seeing from this small beginning one of the largest Sunday schools in the city, numbering between three and four hundred pupils.

It was not long before this upper chamber became a much loved and cherished spot, especially to the poor and the aged in that neighbourhood, and was so full, that it was found very uncomfortable and inconvenient, both for the evening service and the Sunday school. The Association at this time renewed its efforts to obtain a free chapel, and a committee was again appointed to make the necessary arrangements, and raise the funds. The committee did not ask for much,—two thousand dollars only; but it required great effort to raise this sum. Individuals were slow in contributing. They had various doubts and misgivings, and it was thought by many an unwise experiment. Through the untiring exertions of some of its members, a lot of land was, however, purchased in Friend Street, and a neat and commodious wooden chapel was erected.

On the evening of October 27th, 1828, the last service was held in the upper chamber of the Circular Building. In alluding to it, Dr. Tuckerman says, in one of his Reports,—

“ Our present lecture-room has been well filled, inconvenient



as it is, and poor as are the accommodations. To the subscribers to our new place of worship, I beg leave to offer my sincere gratitude. I believe they have done an important service to the cause of our religion among us. Many have been gathered for worship with us on Sunday evening, who would otherwise have worshipped nowhere, and I doubt not there are those among them who have thus been advanced in their preparation for a better world. I owe, also, and will not fail to pay, my thanks to the gentlemen without whose assistance in the conducting of them the services of the lecture-room could not have been maintained."

On Sunday evening, November 10th, 1828, the first service was held in the Friend Street Chapel. Dr. Tuckerman preached the sermon. The services were quite interesting, and the audience large. The hearts of many were made glad that evening, on beholding the new and commodious chapel. The erection of this building gave great permanency to this ministry, and it was now destined to go on and be abundantly blessed.

Not long after Dr. Tuckerman had commenced his services in this chapel, sectarian jealousy was awakened, and he found that many seemed to be in doubt and somewhat alarmed about his theological views. It was rumored that he was a Unitarian, — could he, therefore, be a Christian? Having heard these rumors, the Doctor gave notice that he should present his views on certain controverted points, in a course of lectures. On the following Sunday evening, the chapel was well filled with an attentive audience. The course extended to ten or twelve sermons, in which he presented, in a clear, succinct, and forcible manner, his views upon various Christian doctrines. He spoke not of others, he indulged in no bitter railing, no harsh denunciation against Christians of other denominations; this was not in his heart. The spirit of charity and love dwelt too deeply there to permit this.

Dr. Tuckerman did many good works, but among his best, at this period of his life, many will ever consider this course of lectures, in which, in the most simple manner, united with the most fervid eloquence, he presented his well-digested views upon the doctrines of total depravity, the atonement, and the Trinity, with those on immortality and future retribution. The power which



he then discovered, and which was deeply felt by those who heard him, could not be understood by some, — for it was rarely equalled by him on any other occasion, — till, in reading his memoir, written by one who knew him well, it is mentioned, “that, in the early part of his ministry, he devoted much time to the study of the doctrines of Christianity.” Never, after the delivery of these lectures, was a word said upon these subjects abroad, and he went on, his flock increasing, his services and visits sought after by the poor and afflicted from every part of the city.

In the winter of 1830, Dr. Tuckerman’s health was such that he could preach but seldom, and in the spring of 1831 he earnestly asked, as he had done in his reports for some time previous, that a colleague might be procured. But no one was found. In the spring of 1832, it became necessary for him to relinquish the chapel services in the evening, and, at the close of his Report, Dr. Tuckerman expressed his strong desire that some one should take his place, to whom he might act as an assistant, and on whom might devolve the whole duties of the chapel? This oft-repeated request was at last answered, and Mr. C. F. Barnard entered upon the service, in the fulness of his spirit, in the autumn of 1832, having assisted in the Sunday school connected with the chapel some few months previous.

The evening lectures were now resumed, and continued through the winter and spring, till June, 1833. Mr. Barnard labored most faithfully in this field. He commenced a service for children, which interested them not a little. This service was continued by him, morning and afternoon, for some time, with happy success.

In the autumn of 1834, Mr. Barnard commenced an evening service in a ward-room, at the south part of the city, intending to labor in that section, and carry out this ministry there, which appeared to offer a good opening. In this he was not mistaken. It was not long before he had quite large audiences at his evening service, and the Sunday school which he formed was well attended. His success was quite encouraging, and it was not long before, through his great perseverance and unwearied exertions, and the liberality of the friends of this ministry, the Warren Street Chapel was erected, and dedicated



by appropriate religious services, in January, 1836. Mr. Barnard commenced a service for the children in the morning, and in the afternoon and evening for adults. Of the good accomplished by him, especially among the young, it is useless here to speak, for it is known to all, and his chapel is one of the cherished institutions of the city.

Mr. Barnard was succeeded at the Friend Street Chapel by F. T. Gray, who entered upon his duties in October, 1833. At first, services were held as before, during the day and evening, on the Sabbath, the morning service being mainly adapted to the young. On the commencement, soon after, of a regular adult service during the day and evening, the audience greatly increased, and the Sunday school presented a very pleasing aspect, cheering the hearts of the teachers, who had labored with great fidelity, many of them from the commencement of the ministry. The following extract from a Report of the Ministers at Large about this time will give some idea of the state of things in 1834.

"There are now over two hundred children connected with the Howard Sunday School, who are instructed by thirty-eight teachers, with two superintendents, whose interest and fidelity to those committed to their care, during the past winter, deserve great commendation. They have been untiring in their exertions to interest and engage their pupils in holy things. Their efforts have been crowned with success. The valuable assistance rendered by the superintendent and teachers of this school to the friends of this ministry, the Ministers at Large cannot but acknowledge. It encourages us to persevere with them in efforts to promote the happiness and moral welfare of our less favored brethren."

We are the more ready to make this extract, because those who were then engaged exerted an influence, by their fidelity and perseverance in their holy work, that was deeply felt at the time in the community, and more than one church since has felt the influence which was exerted upon the pupils of this school by them in whom they were so much interested, and over whom they watched with such unceasing care for several years. No good cause could fail, with such warm, devoted, and faithful friends.

Dr. Tuckerman had, from the commencement of his



ministry, been under the patronage of the American Unitarian Association, to which body he addressed his Reports, and by whom they were published, receiving from the Association the sum of four hundred dollars per annum for his services. In May, 1834, as the ministers had increased, and the work was gaining in interest and importance, more definite and efficient aid was necessary; hence the Fraternity of Churches was formed. From that period the ministry has been supported by annual contributions from each of the Unitarian societies in the city, which are paid into the treasury of the Fraternity. The last year, between five and six thousand dollars was contributed by these societies for the support of this excellent ministry.

In 1835, through the persevering exertions of some gentlemen who were engaged as teachers in the Friend Street Chapel, an effort was made to erect a more commodious chapel, commensurate with the wants of the poor in that section of the city. That effort was successful; a sufficient amount was subscribed, with the amount received from the sale of the old chapel and land, to enable them to go on, obtaining the balance by a loan, which was needed for a few years only. A site was selected in Pitts Street, and a neat and commodious brick building erected, at an expense of sixteen thousand dollars, including the land.

And now there was a change to take place at the old and much loved Friend Street Chapel. Change had been going on all around it in ten years, and now it was to be seen within. On the afternoon of November 6th, 1836, the last sermon was preached in this chapel, by the pastor, from the text, "Lord, I have loved the habitation of thine house, and the place where thine honor dwelleth." There were many sad hearts on leaving this place; for it was loved, and around it had gathered many holy recollections, and many sweet remembrances of hours passed with cherished friends, who had united in worship together, at the evening hour, where they had been permitted to listen to holy truths, as they fell from the lips, not only of the beloved Tuckerman, but also of the gifted Follen, Greenwood, and Ware.

But that humble building is not, and never will be, forgotten by many a grateful heart. It is safely enshrined



in the memory of many, who received instruction and solace within its walls. And it will live long, — long as the touching and eloquent tribute to that lowly building shall be retained, which was paid to it by the beloved Greenwood. “The little chapel in Friend Street! Small and humble as it is, I never pass the spot on which it stands without a mental thanksgiving. Modest mother of poor men’s churches! Lowly and plain, but beautiful and holy cathedral of charity! Blessed is the work which thou hast witnessed and fostered! Thy walls are slight, and must soon be removed, but thy form will remain in the memories of many who have been taught in thee, and be ever associated with the poor man’s friend!”

On the following Sabbath, November 13th, a bright and happy band of children and teachers was seen hastening to the new and well furnished chapel in Pitts Street. The morning was somewhat lowering, but the clouds soon passed away, and a large and deeply interested audience was assembled at the dedication. The sermon was preached by the minister of the chapel, and Rev. Mr. Barnard, Rev. Louis Dwight, and Rev. William Collier took part in the services. It was thus, in the spirit of Christian charity with all denominations, that the services were commenced, and the same has been continued and manifested to the present hour, — ever remembering the truth embodied in the following extract from one of the Reports of the Ministers at Large, in 1835.

“We have learned, and we trust that we shall never forget, that our chapels are not to be made arenas for theological controversy. No friend of the poor can wish to distract them with the claims and tenets of conflicting sects. To go among the poor with sectarian purposes would retard rather than advance their social, moral, and religious improvement. To attempt to form them under this or that denomination is a direct, serious injury. It calls forth jealousy, prejudice, and party feeling. It dissevers and divides those who should feel and act as brethren. It draws off their attention from weightier matters. It leaves out of view the only two points around which the poor and the friend of the poor should rally, — *Love to God, and love to man.*”

Rev. J. T. Sargent entered upon his duties as Minister at Large in the summer of 1837, and a room was selected,



in Northampton Street, in which to hold a religious service on the Sabbath, and establish a Sunday school. He selected the extreme south part of the city for his field of labor. After some few months, a more commodious hall was found in a new building in Suffolk Street, and to this he removed his school, and for some time had religious services during the day and evening of the Sabbath. Mr. Sargent soon awakened quite an interest in this ministry, and he was eminently successful in his labors. He was faithful and untiring in his exertions to promote the welfare of those to whom he especially ministered, and it was not long before a sum was subscribed sufficient for the erection of a new chapel, in Suffolk Street. The corner-stone was laid May 23d, 1839, and the occasion was one that will long be remembered by many who were present, from the fact, that it was the last public service in which Dr. Tuckerman took part,—the last time that his voice was heard, and the last time that many looked upon his venerated form. Who that was present will forget the fervent petition which he offered on that occasion, as the multitude were gathered around him, and his gray locks were fanned by the breeze, on that beautiful spring afternoon?

The chapel was dedicated February 5th, 1840, and Mr. Sargent labored there, greatly encouraged, till December 29th, 1844, when he resigned.

We have now given a brief history of the origin of the Ministry at Large in Boston, and a sketch of the *early history* of its chapels. As we have been thus reviewing the last twenty-eight years, many weighty questions have arisen and many pregnant thoughts have suggested themselves, which we have not space to notice or even name, though we may present them at some future period. But of one thing we have been most deeply impressed, as we have gone on step by step, studying the records of an exceedingly interesting portion of our ecclesiastical history as a denomination; and that is, the immense influence which this Ministry at Large has exerted among all classes in this community,—an influence which no words can describe or calculations measure. For well and truly has it been said, by one who did a most excellent service by his labors for several months in this ministry, “What language can describe or calculations meas-



ure this influence? When the joy of salvation can be adequately portrayed, when the depth of despair can be sounded, then, and then only, will the limits of the influence flowing from this blessed ministry fully appear."

F. T. G.

---

ART. IV. — SYDNEY SMITH'S SKETCHES OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY.\*

SYDNEY SMITH exhibited a rare combination of character,—consummate wit and consummate discretion. When written to by the son and biographer of Sir James Mackintosh for some of his late father's letters, Mr. Smith replied,—“Upon principle, I keep no letters except those on business. I have not a single letter from him, nor from any human being, in my possession.” Such was his solicitude lest the unguarded pleasantries of a familiar correspondence should afterwards lead to misunderstandings, or give unnecessary pain. As a preacher, also, he knew what belonged to the decorum of the pulpit, and the seriousness and gravity of his theme. There are fewer conceits of thought or language in the whole of his three volumes of sermons than in many a single page of South. Better proof of his judgment and of the essential kindness and generosity of his disposition could hardly be had than is furnished by the fact, that, though everywhere accounted one of the greatest wits of his time, he was more loved than feared. The tradition of his wit and raillery in conversation will die away, but we have an enduring monument of both in his critical and controversial writings. Here, however, to do him justice, his keenest shafts were reserved for legitimate occasions;—when some new folly was to be shown up, when some new pretender was to be unmasked, or when conceit and affectation were to be taught to know themselves. No doubt, to the objects of his merciless banter the pain was often as great as if they had been pursued by violent and angry invective; but to the writer and

---

\* *Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution, in the Years 1804, 1805, and 1806.* By the late Rev. SYDNEY SMITH, M. A. London. 1850. 8vo. pp. xii. and 424.



reader it is certainly a great gain, where, as in this case, good humor is made to do the work of bad, and do it quite as effectually.

The posthumous publication before us will add to the author's reputation as an agreeable writer, of excellent judgment and temper, who was able, perhaps beyond any one who ever attempted it before or since, to relieve the general dryness and triteness of the subject by the unfailing resources of a light and playful fancy. It consists of twenty-seven lectures, delivered forty-five years ago at the Royal Institution before a mixed audience of ladies and gentlemen, on a series of topics never very popular in England, and much less considered at that time than now. Portions of some of them, with the modifications and amplifications which the change required, found their way into the early numbers of the *Edinburgh Review*, under the titles of *Professional Education*, *Female Education*, and *Public Schools*. The rest of the manuscript, being thrown aside as useless, was left among the author's papers in a neglected and mutilated form, in which state it was submitted to his early and constant friend, Lord Jeffrey, with a view to his opinion on the question of publication. This opinion is understood to have been adverse. Accordingly the work was printed, in the first instance, for private circulation, but was everywhere so favorably received as to induce the family to withhold it no longer from the world. Lord Jeffrey took the earliest opportunity to retract his former judgment, and to say, as we think he could with perfect justice, "The book seems to me to be full of good sense, acuteness, and right feeling, very clearly and pleasingly written, and with such a mixture of logical intrepidity, with the absence of all dogmatism, as is rarely met with in the conduct of such discussions."

At the same time we are not surprised that the great *Edinburgh critic*, when first applied to, should have spoken as discouragingly as he did, if, as is probable, he contented himself with glancing here and there at what remains of the *First Course*. The two lectures on the *History of Philosophy* are almost worthless, especially in what is said of the ancients and of the Continent, from the manifest incompetency of the lecturer to do justice to the subject. These are followed by five on the *Intellect-*



ual Faculties, most of them mere disjointed fragments of no considerable value; so much so, that we think it would have been better if they had been omitted entirely.

The Second Course, consisting of lectures on Wit and Humor, on Taste, on the Beautiful and the Sublime, and on the Faculties of Animals as compared with those of Men, is full of amusement and instruction. Take as a specimen what is said of the moral aspects of wit:—

“I wish, after all I have said about wit and humor, I could satisfy myself of their good effects upon the character and disposition; but I am convinced the probable tendency of both is, to corrupt the understanding and the heart. I am not speaking of wit where it is kept down by more serious qualities of mind, and thrown into the background of the picture; but where it stands out boldly and emphatically, and is evidently the master quality in any particular mind. Professed wits, though they are generally courted for the amusement they afford, are seldom respected for the qualities they possess. The habit of seeing things in a witty point of view increases, and makes incursions from its own proper regions, upon principles and opinions which are ever held sacred by the wise and good. A witty man is a dramatic performer: in process of time, he can no more exist without applause, than he can exist without air; if his audience be small, or if they are inattentive, or if a new wit defrauds him of any portion of his admiration, it is all over with him,—he sickens, and is extinguished. The applauses of the theatre on which he performs are so essential to him, that he must obtain them at the expense of decency, friendship, and good feeling. It must always be *probable*, too, that a *mere* wit is a person of light and frivolous understanding. His business is not to discover relations of ideas that are *useful*, and have a real influence upon life, but to discover the more trifling relations which are only amusing; he never looks at things with the naked eye of common sense, but is always gazing at the world through a Claude Lorraine glass,—discovering a thousand appearances which are created only by the instrument of inspection, and covering every object with factitious and unnatural colors. In short, the character of a *mere* wit it is impossible to consider as very amiable, very respectable, or very safe. So far the world, in judging of wit, where it has swallowed up all other qualities, judge aright; but I doubt if they are sufficiently indulgent to this faculty where it exists in a lesser degree, and as one out of many other ingredients of the understanding. There is an association in men's minds between dulness and wisdom, amusement and folly, which has a very powerful influence in decision upon char-



acter, and is not overcome without considerable difficulty. The reason is, that the *outward* signs of a dull man and a wise man are the same, and so are the outward signs of a frivolous man and a witty man; and we are not to expect that the majority will be disposed to look to much *more* than the outward sign. I believe the fact to be, that wit is very seldom the *only* eminent quality which resides in the mind of any man; it is commonly accompanied by many other talents of every description, and ought to be considered as a strong evidence of a fertile and superior understanding." — pp. 149 – 151.

On the subject of the influence of association in matters of taste, the lecturer thinks that Alison goes too far. He observes:—

"One circumstance, which appears to have led to these conclusions, is the example of those same sensations which are sometimes ludicrous, sometimes sublime, sometimes fearful, according to the ideas with which they are associated. For instance, the sound of a trumpet suggests the dreadful idea of a battle, and of the approach of armed men; but to all men brought up at Queen's College, Oxford, it must be associated with eating and drinking, for they are always called to dinner by sound of trumpet: and I have a little daughter at home, who, if she heard the sound of a trumpet, would run to the window, expecting to see the puppet-show of Punch, which is carried about the streets. So with a hiss: a hiss is either foolish, or tremendous, or sublime. The hissing of a pancake is absurd; the first faint hiss that arises from the extremity of the pit, on the evening of a new play, sinks the soul of the author within him, and makes him curse himself and his Thalia; the hissing of a *cobra di capello* is sublime,—it is the whisper of death! But all these instances prove nothing; for we are not denying that there are many sounds, tastes, and sights, which nature has made so indifferent, that association may make them any thing. It is very true what Mr. Alison says, 'that there are many sensations universally called sublime, which association may make otherwise.' This is true enough, but it is not to the purpose. I admit readily, that a fortuitous connection of thought can make it otherwise than sublime; but the question is, Did it receive from nature the character of sublime? Does *any* thing receive from nature the character of sublime, or the character of beautiful? And would any thing perpetually display, and constantly preserve, such character, if no accident intervened to raise up a contrary association? Certainty on such subjects cannot be attained; but I, for one, strongly believe in the affirmative of the question,—that Nature speaks to the mind of man *immediately*



in beautiful and sublime language ; that she astonishes him with magnitude, appalls him with darkness, cheers him with splendor, soothes him with harmony, captivates him with emotion, enchants him with fame ; she never intended man should walk among her flowers, and her fields, and her streams, unmoved ; nor did she rear the strength of the hills in vain, or mean that we should look with a stupid heart on the wild glory of the torrent, bursting from the darkness of the forest, and dashing over the crumbling rock." — pp. 163, 164.

He gives the following admirable illustration of what is meant by *moral* beauty :—

" I have said a great deal about prospect and landscape ; I will mention an action or two, which appear to me to convey as distinct a feeling of the beautiful as any landscape whatever. A London merchant, who, I believe, is still alive, while he was staying in the country with a friend, happened to mention that he intended, the next year, to buy a ticket in the lottery ; his friend desired he would buy one for him at the same time, which of course was very willingly agreed to. The conversation dropped, the ticket never arrived, and the whole affair was entirely forgotten, when the country gentleman received information that the ticket purchased for him by his friend had come up a prize of £20,000. Upon his arrival in London, he inquired of his friend where he had put the ticket, and why he had not informed him that it was purchased. ' I bought them both the same day, mine and your ticket, and I flung them both into a drawer of my bureau, and I never thought of them afterwards.' ' But how do you distinguish one ticket from the other ? and why am I the holder of the fortunate ticket, more than you ? ' ' Why, at the time I put them into the drawer, I put a little mark in ink upon the ticket which I resolved should be yours ; and upon re-opening the drawer, I found that the one so marked was the fortunate ticket.' Now this action appears to me perfectly beautiful ; it is *le beau idéal* in morals, and gives that calm, yet deep emotion of pleasure, which every one so easily receives from the beauty of the exterior world." — p. 209.

His two lectures on the Conduct of the Understanding abound in useful suggestions. We copy a characteristic passage on study, not as it generally is, but as it ought to be.

" Besides the shame of inferiority, and the love of reputation, curiosity is a passion very favorable to the love of study ; and a passion very susceptible of increase by cultivation. Sound travels so many feet in a second ; and light travels so many feet



in a second. Nothing more probable : but you do not care *how* light and sound travel. Very likely : but *make* yourself care ; get up, shake yourself well, *pretend* to care, make believe to care, and very soon you *will* care, and care so much, that you will sit for hours thinking about light and sound, and be extremely angry with any one who interrupts you in your pursuits ; and tolerate no other conversation but about light and sound ; and catch yourself plaguing every body to death who approaches you, with the discussion of these subjects. I am sure that a man ought to read as he would grasp a nettle : — do it lightly, and you get molested ; grasp it with all your strength, and you feel none of its asperities. There is nothing so horrible as languid study ; when you sit looking at the clock, wishing the time was over, or that somebody would call on you and put you out of your misery. The only way to read with any efficacy is to read so heartily, that dinner-time comes two hours before you expected it. To sit with your Livy before you, and hear the geese cackling that saved the Capitol ; and to see with your own eyes the Carthaginian suttlers gathering up the rings of the Roman knights after the battle of Cannæ, and heaping them into bushels ; and to be so intimately present at the actions you are reading of, that, when any body knocks at the door, it will take you two or three seconds to determine whether you are in your own study, or in the plains of Lombardy, looking at Hannibal's weatherbeaten face, and admiring the splendor of his single eye ; — this is the only kind of study which is not tiresome ; and almost the only kind which is not useless : this is the knowledge which gets into the system, and which a man carries about and uses like his limbs, without perceiving that it is extraneous, weighty, or inconvenient." — pp. 277, 278.

Again, on the uses of conversation compared with books : —

"The advantage conversation has over all the other modes of improving the mind is, that it is more natural and more interesting. A book has no eyes, and ears, and feelings ; the best are apt every now and then to become a little languid : whereas a living book walks about, and varies his conversation and manner, and prevents you from going to sleep. There is certainly a great evil in this, as well as a good ; for the interest between a man and his living folio becomes sometimes a little too keen, and in the competition for victory they become a little too animated towards, and sometimes exasperated against, each other : whereas a man and his book generally keep the peace with tolerable success ; and if they disagree, the man shuts his book, and tosses it into a corner of the room, which it might not be quite so safe or easy to do with a living folio. It is an incon-



venience in a book, that you cannot ask questions; there is no explanation: and a man is less guarded in conversation than in a book, and tells you with more honesty the little niceties and exceptions of his opinions; whereas in a book, as his opinions are canvassed where they cannot be explained and defended, he often overstates a point for fear of being misunderstood; but then, on the contrary, almost every man talks a great deal better in his books, with more sense, more information, and more reflection, than he can possibly do in his conversation, because he has more time.

“There are few good listeners in the world who make all the use that they might make of the understandings of others, in the conduct of their own. The use made of this great instrument of conversation is the display of superiority, not the gaining of those materials on which superiority may rightfully and justly be founded. Every man takes a different view of a question as he is influenced by constitution, circumstances, age, and a thousand other peculiarities; and no individual ingenuity can sift and examine a subject with as much variety and success as the minds of many men, put in motion by many causes, and affected by an endless variety of accidents. Nothing, in my humble opinion, would bring an understanding so forward, as this habit of ascertaining and weighing the opinions of others; — a point in which almost all men of abilities are deficient; whose first impulse, if they are young, is too often to contradict; or, if the manners of the world have cured them of that, to listen only with attentive ears, but with most obdurate and unconquerable entrails. I may be very wrong, and probably am so, but, in the whole course of my life, I do not know that I ever saw a man of considerable understanding respect the understandings of others as much as he might have done for his own improvement, and as it was just that he should do.” — pp. 282, 283.

The Third and last Course treats of the Active Powers of the Mind, including the various affections, passions, and desires, and closes with two lectures on Habit. In this part of his work the author begins to betray symptoms of weariness of the subject; at any rate, he enters on the discussion of some of the disputed points with a very inadequate acquaintance with the merits of the question and the history of the controversy. In illustration of the last remark, we would refer to what he says of the *origin* of the passions, a topic on which he not only breaks with the Scotch, whom he generally follows, but takes the extreme ground maintained by the Hart-



leian school. Still, there is no lecture which could well be spared, and some of those now under consideration are among the most practically useful in the volume. In the following passage, the effect of civilization on the importance attached to the passions and affections is depicted in his peculiar manner.

"I take it to be a consequence of civilization, that all the feelings of mind which proceed from the body excite little sympathy, in comparison with those which have not a bodily origin. The loss of a leg or an arm is a dreadful misfortune; but the slightest disgrace would be considered as a much greater. To be laid up seven months by the gout every year is a piteous state of existence; to lose a brother or a sister is a state of existence, in common estimation, still more miserable. The slightest pang of jealousy, or wounded pride, may be brought upon the stage; but the most intense pain of body, introduced into a play, would excite laughter rather than compassion. Who would endure a tragedy, where the whole distress turned upon a fit of the palsy, or a smart rheumatic fever? Nothing could be more exquisitely ridiculous! The fact is, as a nation advances in the useful arts, all bodily evils are so much mitigated, and guarded against, that they cease to excite that sympathy which they formerly did, because they are less generally felt. How ridiculous, as I before remarked, a play would be, of which a hungry man were the hero! Why? — because we never suffer from extreme hunger, and have very little sympathy for it; there is hardly any such thing known in civilized society: the author himself would, probably, be the only man in the whole play-house who had ever seriously felt the want of a dinner. But if a nation of savages were to see such a drama acted, they would see no ridicule in it at all; because starving to death is, among them, no uncommon thing: they are advanced such a little way in civilization, that to fill their stomachs is the great and important object of life: and I have no doubt, that, to an Indian audience, the loss of a piece of venison might be the basis of a tragedy which would fill every eye with tears; but, on the contrary, they might be very likely to laugh, to hear a man complain of his wounded honor, if it turned out that he had ten days' provisions beforehand in his cabin. In the same manner, the loss of a leg is the consummation of all evil, where there is nothing but body; but it becomes an evil of the lowest order, where there remain behind the pleasures of imagination, of elegant learning, of the fine arts, of all the luxuries and glories of civilization, — the tendency of which is always to put down and vilify every thing which belongs to the body, and to exalt all the feelings in which the mind alone is concerned. In some of the



Greek tragedies, there is an attempt to excite compassion by the representation of the agonies of bodily pain. Philoctetes cries out and faints from the extremity of his suffering, exclaiming upon the stage, 'O Jupiter! my leg, my leg!' Hippolytus and Hercules are both introduced as expiring under the severest torments. These attempts to excite compassion by the representation of bodily pain are certainly among the greatest breaches of decorum, of which the Greek theatre has set the example; and afford a strong suspicion that their audience was less elegant and refined than that which presides over our modern theatres. And the reason why such sort of appeals to the passions would not now be tolerated is not so much on account of the pain they would excite (because the sufferings of the mind excite pain), but because *bodily* pain is a dull, stupid, unvarying, uninteresting spectacle, in comparison with all those critical and delicate emotions of mind, which are universally felt in a state of civilization, — and in that state alone." — pp. 364–366.

Many readers of this work will be surprised to find that metaphysics, as the English persist in miscalling it, or the science of the human mind, can be made as fit a subject for popular lecturing as any of the physical sciences. Its leading topics are not so far removed from the range of ordinary thought; its language is by no means so technical or so unfamiliar; it is more capable than any other science of historical illustration and rhetorical embellishment; it has less to do with perplexing and unsettled questions than geology or physiology, both of which are now so much in vogue; and as for its paramount utility it is enough to say, that the knowledge of mind, or of human nature, is the knowledge of ourselves.

J. W.

---

ART. V. — FEUERBACH'S ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.\*

It is somewhat noteworthy, that one of the comparatively few books dropped from the German press during the last year should have been a new edition of this

---

\* *Das Wesen des Christenthum.* Von LUDWIG FEUERBACH. Dritte ungearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: Verlag von Otto Wigand. 1849. [The *Essence of Christianity*. By LUDWIG FEUERBACH. Third Edition, revised and improved.]



work of Feuerbach. More conclusive evidence of its popularity could not be found, nor — may we not add? — of its adaptation to the particular fervor of the time. Political agitation has had no good results for book-writers and book-printers, though we must do the Leipzig publishers the justice to say, that the peril to their pockets seems to have had little effect on their republican ardor. The times have a sympathy for Feuerbach. We are not aware what his political views may be, and indeed have been informed that those of his co-laborer, Strauss, are extremely conservative: but in the author of this book we can hardly fancy a very violent champion of the throne. Radicalism is a consuming fire, which has no animating principle but an intense hatred of the past; it devours without discrimination whatever is, that it may lay anew the foundations for its glorious future. It unites the hostility against church and state, and, whether voluntarily or not, compels them to serve the same purpose. As the great revolution of France was kindled and fed by hands that contributed to the pages of the *Encyclopædia*, we are not surprised to find the modern spirit of political reform putting itself in antagonism to Christianity; and it is a certain fact, that the radical leaders of modern Germany are as free-thinking in their way as the disciples of Voltaire, or that “proselyting atheist,” Diderot.

But the atheism of Feuerbach, if as sweeping as that of the French school of accomplished materialists, is far more worthy our respect; it is the child of a grave and earnest philosophy, not of a frivolous buffoonery. If it loosens the reins of speculation, it never relaxes those of the morals; if it ascends to the seventh heaven of mystical speculation, it speaks always the intelligible language of earth; if it leaves us to the desolation of a godless universe, it does not plunder nor tarnish the jewel of our self-respect; if it annihilates Deity, it seeks to give every man something of the dignity of a god.

Feuerbach is a disciple of Hegel.\* This book is the

---

\* At different times during the last twenty years Feuerbach has appeared before the public, and his views are contained in a series of volumes, which bear the following titles: — “Philosophical Criticisms and Principles,” — “Thoughts on Death and Immortality,” — “History of Modern Philosophy from Bacon of Verulam to Benedict Spinoza,” — “Exposition, Develop-



voice of what has been called the "Left Wing" of Hegelians. From the same ranks Bauer has given utterance to a "Biblisches Christenthum," and Strauss to a "Glaubenslehre" and a "Leben Jesu." Who is to decide whether all this array of speculation is Hegelianism, — legitimate offspring of the great principle? Could their master speak from his grave, he would probably disclaim them. But Hegelianism is fairly divided against itself; its good promises of unity have vanished into air; the completion of all philosophic speculation, the goal of all philosophic struggle, is but the starting-point of a new contest, and the vista of metaphysical wrangling opens as interminable as ever. And how soon the dream is past! The voice still rings in our ears; we seem to hear its pleasant assurance, that these intricate questions, which have vexed the brains of the learned from Heraclitus to Schelling, had received their final solution; that the mighty structure of metaphysical speculation, which had been built on with ceaseless toil and Babel confusion of tongues, had been crowned at last, and the capping-stone, whose elevation was celebrated with such solemn ceremonies, was the famous "principle of identity." But it is in vain; the boasted completion threatens to be but a Sisyphus's labor. A keen commentator affirms that Hegel has got hold of the same stone of which it is said, —

"Glaubt er ihn aber  
Schon auf dem Gipfel zu drehn, da mit einmal stürzte die hast um  
Hurtig hinab mit Gepolter entrollte der tückische Marnur." \*

The "principle of identity" has not even produced unity among its own disciples. They are diverging from each other in all directions, and we feel certain that the blank atheism of the book before us, if its legitimate deduction, would be more repulsive to none than to the great high-priest himself.

The various departments to which the Hegelian philosophy applies have been supported with unusual talent, and, what is a little remarkable, talent of the most prac-

---

ment, and Criticism of the Philosophy of Leibnitz," — "Pierre Bayle, a Contribution to the History of Philosophy and Manhood," — "The Essence of Christianity," and a "Supplementary Volume on the Essence of Christianity."

\* "The huge round stone, resulting with a bound,  
Thunders impetuous down, and smokes along the ground."  
Pope's *Odyssey*, XI. 737.



tical character. They are in striking contrast to the dreamy votaries of Schelling, who revelled in their fantasies and "nur zum Genieszen eilten."\* The theoretical philosophy from which the book before us springs is one of the most obscure and unintelligible the world has ever known, but the book itself is neither obscure nor unintelligible. It is an eminently popular book; it is written for the people; it is an attempt to bring the practical results of abstract principles within the scope of those who could never ascend to the fountain-head. It is more attractive in style than most works on this class of subjects, for it studiously avoids the use of uncouth nomenclature and awkward phrases. It has claim to that greatest beauty of style, complete simplicity; and if we are sometimes compelled to notice the paucity of ideas, and the constant recurrence of the ground-thought of the book, yet we cannot deny that it is always presented clothed in a pleasing variety of language. The product of a mystical philosophy, it is remarkable for its entire lack of any thing that approaches mysticism.

"I am at a heaven-wide difference," says the author (Vorrede, S. 10), "from those philosophers who tear their eyes out of their heads that they may think better;—for thought I need the senses, above all, the eyes."

And again (S. 19),—"I have written with a view to men in general, and to no faculty of philosophers. . . . My object has been the greatest simplicity, clearness, and definiteness which the subject permits, so that each cultivated and thinking man can understand it,—mostly at least."

In this he has been perfectly successful: we have rarely read a book which united such acuteness of logic with such beauty of style; such depth of reasoning with such adaptation to the mass of readers. The novelty of thought continually charms us the more by the force of its expression, and this even while we are forced to dissent. That it is a popular book is attested by the fact, that it is the third edition which lies before us, and it is not a book which would be likely to gain access to the libraries of the clerical profession. These three editions must have all been sold to the people, and we well remember it as one of those books which lay on the

---

\* *Hurried to enjoyment.*—Hegel.



reading-room tables of unhappy Baden among the latest novels, essays on republicanism, and pamphlets instructing in the best use of the rifle. Its society indicates the class it appeals to.

We know not how far this "left wing" may have participated in or sympathized with the sanguinary struggle which lately convulsed the ill-fated Palatinate. We do not remember having seen any of their names as members of provisional governments, or prominent speakers in popular diets; but we are certain that their pens have more seriously wounded the divine right of kings than their swords could have done; and that such books as this, spread far and wide, must have had a serious influence on the popular political, as well as religious faith. A man may believe in the Pope, or the Grand Lama's consecrated pills; uproot his faith and you have no power over him longer. He has neither time nor the faculty to make a substitute for the faith of his infancy; you have taught him distrust, and that is a weapon he can turn against you as effectually as against error. Doubt, like the old man of the sea, rarely leaves its victim till it has borne down and mastered him. It requires omniscience itself to set the lines whither it shall go, and no farther. Every revolution, every reform, testifies to the fact that popular ignorance mistakes trifles for essentials, and values them equally; that error always is slain at the expense of truth. Lutheranism had its Anabaptists, freedom has its Red Republicans, and therefore we say that Feuerbach, *volens volens*, propagates atheism and republicanism together. Is it not then a singular spectacle, and one we might moralize on? Here is a speculation which not one man in ten thousand could understand, or even see any thing in it but the most ridiculous absurdity, an idea born in the mind of a retired student, which your practical man scouts and sneers at, arising at last armed and powerful, ready to light the flame of revolution and wield the scourge of war over one of the fairest portions of the globe. So true is it, that abstract principles revenge themselves for neglect or abuse, or vindicate the power of truth.

The German church and state are so closely connected, that Christianity appears in that distracted country as the champion of conservatism, and political re-



form makes often common battle against them both. Much that Feuerbach advances against Christianity in general has the terrific aspect of truth to the Lutheran Christian, whose creed, forced down his throat by the state, he *feels* to be "nothing but show." There, too, the hostility against effete organizations and doctrines is itself deeply tinged by the religious element; sometimes it is the product of fervent religious emotion. The opponents of Christianity therefore stand there to advantage, and strike at a foe whose hands are bound by creeds and customs. No one can feel and relish that advantage more than our friend Feuerbach. Whatever else he may be, he is certainly no covert enemy. He lays no ambushade of pious ejaculation to entrap the unwary reader, but comes boldly forth to grasp our hand, if a friend, or to give manly battle, if a foe. With him there are no soft words, no choice of phrases, no insidious professions of friendship. All is open and above-board, and we thank him that he tells us so freely what he thinks of us. We know how to deal with such an adversary. That weapon is deadliest whose slight wound lulls us into carelessness, while the fatal poison weakens the system. Ludwig's cleaver has no poison about it, but he strikes as if he meant to do the work at once, and leave no vestige of us on the face of the earth. Listen how soundly he berates us all:—

"The essence of the time is *show*. Show, our morality; show, our politics; show, our religion; show, our science. He who speaks the truth is impertinent, immoral; truth is the immorality of the time." — p. 6.

"I have only betrayed the secret of the Christian religion, only rent the theological veil of lies and deceit; — if my book is negative, irreligious, atheistic, remember that atheism, in the sense of this book, is the secret of religion itself." — p. 12.

"Religion is the dream of the human soul."

"Christianity has long since disappeared, not only from the reason, but from the life of man: it is nothing more than a *fixed idea*, which stands in the most direct contrast with our fire and life assurance companies, our railroads and carriages, our peria-cotheks and glyptotheks, our military and mercantile schools, our theatres and museums." — p. 15.

This is our first greeting. It is bold and fair: we are not enticed to read his book without knowing the con.



clusions to which we shall be allured. If these introductory assertions startle or surprise, it is because we are not familiar with speculations of this character, and have not gone through the requisite training. We have not had the "Phenomenology" in our hands. The philosophy which claims to be philosophy perfected remains "a veiled mystery except to the initiated." It has never been current here to undermine our attachment to Christianity. But our author we believe to be a legitimate child of Hegelianism, and his book the legitimate product of Hegelian influences. The course of speculative philosophy, from Locke to the present, naturally closes in Diderot on the one side, and in Feuerbach on the other. The two streams coursing in opposite directions join their waters at last on the dreary wastes of atheism. The materialism of David Hume was succeeded by the profound speculations of Kant, who roused his gigantic powers to throw off the chains which the acute Scot had forged and riveted upon the human reason. Kant steps forth the champion of the subjective element, and in vindicating its claims he lays the foundation of an authority which is destined to be as tyrannical as the one he was resisting. The idealism of Fichte, as profound and beautiful as it is exaggerated, is a natural result of Kantian principles, and here the mind is already all in all, and the objective world practically annihilated. Still there remains some external existence, which, however degraded and powerless, is obstinate and not easily disposed of, and it is left for Hegel to continue the course of speculation to that grand and "final discovery," that subject and object are *identical*. The honor of this discovery has been claimed by Schelling, but Hegel alone has been venturesome enough to carry it out to its true results. It is hard to comprehend the principles on which this profound philosophy is based, but it is not hard to understand the conclusions to which it leads us. Of course, God has no such existence as we have usually assigned him, — an objective existence, of which our souls can take some cognizance. The Deity of such a philosophy does not deserve the title of *Being*. It is a "*natura naturans*" continually unfolding itself, and arriving at *self-consciousness* first in the human mind. This philosophy, unlike most pantheistic speculations, recog-



nizes no substance outside itself. Every soul is a part of this God, which is in constant transition, ever unfolding itself in obedience to its own laws.

This is the philosophy which has given us Strauss and Feuerbach. If Hegel, even with such singular notions of the Deity, retained some respect for that part of our nature commonly called the *religious* perception, the young Hegelians have no such weakness. Strauss's "Life of Jesus" forces historical Christianity into conformity with the great law of development, a law deduced from philosophic principles, and an exception to which no force of testimony can establish. Feuerbach brings the internal character of Christianity to the same Procrustean bed. He will demonstrate to us that religion is "a dream of the human soul," because, in worshipping God, man worships himself. "It lies in the interest of religion to represent God as separate from man," and Christianity is an illusion, because its essence consists in "the sundering of human nature," and the imaginary relation of separate parts which exist only in unity.

The opening chapters of this book contain its philosophy and the principles of its criticism of Christianity, —they contain affirmative propositions; these once mastered and agreed to, we need ask no more. We can draw our own deductions, without farther assistance from our teacher. We have in few words the key to the system, the constantly recurring idea of the book; we might open at random, and we should not fail to find it on the page before us, diluted or condensed, naked or tricked out with fantastic drapery, still the same old friend, — "Das absolute Wesen, der Gott des Menschen ist sein eigenes Wesen," — "The absolute Being, man's God, is his own being." This is the great discovery to which Herr Feuerbach's "identity" clew has led him. It is a statement easily made, and as easily comprehended. To analyze the process, and point out any steps of *proof* which may lead to such a conclusion, would be a more difficult task. Herr Feuerbach stands on the other side of the river, and beckons us with violent gesticulations to come over and join him. It is in vain we entreat him to point out the stepping-stones where we may pass over dry-shod; we get nothing in



reply but beckonings and incoherent shouts; we must take the logical vault which seems to have carried him there, or remain where we are. We give the gist of a page or two of this affirmative part of the book.

“Religion is based on the essential difference between man and beast: beasts have no religion: but this difference is in consciousness the knowledge of himself: man has a knowledge of himself which differs from that of the beast both in kind and degree, — he knows himself as an individual and also as one of a species; man alone has a twofold life, an inward and an outward, — his inward life is one ‘im Verhältniss zu seiner Gattung, seinem Wesen.’ But this distinction between man and beast is not only the ground, but also the *object*, of religion. But religion is the consciousness of the Infinite; it is and can, then, be nothing but man’s consciousness of his own infinite being.”

Truly a vast amount gained in a page and a half!

“Man is nothing without an object, — that alone calls out the activity of his powers. In an object he sees himself as in a mirror, — his object is his own revealed being. Sun, moon, and stars call to man, *Γνώθι σαυρόν*, for to each man they appear different, and that each sees them as he sees them is a witness to his own being. Since God is but our own being, the might of any object over us is the might of our own being. In willing, loving, feeling, etc., there is no influence but of ourselves over ourselves.

“All limiting of the reason rests on error. An individual may be conscious of a limitation in himself, but only because the infinity and perfection of the species is an object of his consciousness. A man’s feeling of shame may bind the fetters he feels as an individual on the whole race, but it is delusion; it is delusion to suppose the nature of man a limited nature. Each being finds satisfaction in itself, (*Jedes Wesen ist sich selbst genug*,) — its limits exist only for another being beyond and above it.”

Why not, then, *God*, friend Feuerbach? Why not measure human life and greatness by the life and greatness of the Infinite Spirit, as the worm is limited, not for itself, but for man?

“If you think infinity or feel infinity, it is the infinity of thought and feeling; nothing else. The knowledge of God is the knowledge of ourselves, for the religious object is within us, — as a man’s thoughts so his God, and *vice versâ*, as a man’s God so his thoughts. God is man’s revealed inner nature, his pronounced self. Religion is the solemn unveiling of the con-



cealed treasures of humanity, the disclosure of its secret thoughts, the confession of its dearest secrets. The Christian religion is the relation of man to his own being as to another being. God is a collection of predicates without subjective existence."

And so on.

We admire the skill and coolness with which Feuerbach begins his work. We admire the manner in which he takes for granted before our face the very propositions we were waiting to hear demonstrated, and we are ready to give our author the palm for audacity, if not for logic. Why, the first thing we light on is the proclamation that the *object of religion* is manhood, as distinct from the nature of beasts, and that we have nothing to do but worship ourselves. Grant this, and we need trouble ourselves about "the essence of Christianity" no more; it will not be worth our while to follow out his deductions.

The truth spoken in these pages we perceive and acknowledge; we wish it could be preached in every pulpit in Christendom how much of anthropomorphism there is in our religion. No doctor of divinity could better illustrate that beautiful text of Christianity, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," than Herr Feuerbach has done. The human mind *must* tinge the nature of God with something of its humanity, for we bear the character in outline as it were within us; an indefinite conception, which every man must fill up as his disposition suggests. Our God is, in a certain sense, as various as are our characters, and one man worships love, another power, another beauty. So far we agree with our author, so far we bear God within us, and are gods to ourselves; but farther we cannot go, and we have no method left for us to deal with him, save to oppose assertion to assertion. We have no other way left to deal with him, for it is his very postulates and axioms which most startle us. When a man comes to us and says, "The absolute Being is only ourselves," and that on one of the opening pages of his book, we can only say in reply, "We do not believe it." If he adds that "in sensuous things there is an object beyond us, in religious only an object within," and then proceeds to affirm, that "here applies without limitation the proposition, The object of man is nothing but his own objec-



tive being," we have only to say, "We cannot follow the logic," and yet it is on such a bold affirmation as this that the whole book rests.

We find no rock of offence in the statement that different characters entertain different conceptions of God, nor do we see why it would not be perfectly natural that a bird or a flower, supposing it endowed with taste and the religious faculties, should fancy its God in the form of a bird or a flower. We claim as the essence of religion the very truth which Feuerbach here acknowledges for his own purposes, that very yearning after something greater than ourselves, which is as wide-spread as manhood. It may take the countless shapes of national or of individual character, Jupiter, or Dagon, or fire, or the ox, or serpent, still *a God*.

It is folly to talk of *demonstrating* God's existence; we cannot argue with a man to whom it is not a matter of inward consciousness, any more than we can discuss colors with a blind man. God's being is an object of faith, and not of demonstration, and all attempts at proof have been signal failures. "L'instrument par lequel la persuasion se fait n'est pas la seule démonstration," says Pascal. "Combien y a-t-il peu de choses démontreées! . . . . La coutume fait nos preuves le plus fortes."—"The instrument by which conviction is effected is not solely demonstration. How few things there are which can be demonstrated! Custom gives us our strongest proofs." If we do not believe God is because we cannot believe otherwise, then we despair of conviction by ontological arguments, or by arguments of design. Human nature decides the matter for itself; its "Wesen" calls for a God, and worship is as much a want of manhood as eating or sleeping. Schleiermacher, that noblest product of the Christian mystical philosophy of the present century, has put this matter on its right basis, and there is no page of psychology which contains a deeper truth than that impressive text of Mark, "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein." Feuerbach himself apprehends it, when he says, "The childish feeling is the essence of religion." Religion is not knowledge or speculation, it is feeling, and that feeling, we are convinced, is not condemned to the miserable frivolous de-



ceit of wasting itself upon itself, like a kitten in pursuit of its tail. It has an object; an existing, independent object. Our book says, "There is a consciousness of an infinite object," but it is a gratuitous assertion that that object is only in our sickly fancies. "Religion is based on the essential difference of man from beast." But what is that difference? The lower creation, its physical wants supplied, is contented and satisfied: not so with man; he finds in his breast a latent dissatisfaction, which seems peculiar to him as a rational creature. The sphere in which he moves seems sometimes narrow and contracted. He would fain get beyond it, but Earth holds him in with the impenetrable walls of her prison-cell, and his body drags him down, like heavy fetters that for long years have rested on him, — the very struggle gives him an acuter pain, the iron hath so eaten into his limbs. Yet why is it that man cannot eat his bread and drink his water from the hand of his jailer, and sink back to rest, like the dog at his feet, contented with his lot? Why is it that he alone cannot slumber away the hours, or pace, within the realm of possibility his chains permit him to traverse, the worn stone around his dungeon pillar? Why is it that that stream of early light which breaks through the grating, and pencils on yonder ever-dripping stone its report of life and freedom without, and the bird that by chance flew past his window this morning, with lightest carol, give him thoughts of another world, the rushing of free winds and the waving of forest boughs as they march under them? Why is it that the low arch above him seems at times to dissolve and break away, and there bends over him only the blue vault of ether, with the serene stars, like the all-seeing eyes of God, and when he comes back again his chains seem heavier, his dungeon damper and more stifling? Why is it that he alone so aspires, if it be only so to suffer, and the very faculties of finer mould seem made only to be sources of torment? Why is it that he must find his anguish mocked by the contented satisfaction of those who share his captivity, and the calm routine with which day follows day?

He is a *man*, and, though he has many organs like the beasts, he has actually little kindred with them. It is said of the Indian dragon, — the truthful Philostratus is



our authority, — that if you cleave the skull you will find a sparkling jewel in his brain. Open the heart of a human being, and you will find the signet that seals his claim to manhood. It is the sense of that which surpasses all mental powers, the conception of that greatness which lip cannot define, nor pen nor pencil illustrate; it is the knowledge of that power which transcends all limits, that infinity which has existence for man alone of all mortal beings. It is Feuerbach's "Wesen der Gattung"; it is God.

We should be less inclined to dispute the question of subjective existence, if Feuerbach could give us any pledge for the preservation of our relations to this Being expressed by religion. But this neither he nor any other man can do. You pluck the heart out of religion when you take *life* from God's attributes. This book would palm off on man a miserable show, a paltry idol, toward whom those affectionate feelings expressed by religion could not exist for a moment. And on this ground we tell the author that he has either made a grievous mistake or plays a despicable game with human feelings. The distinction between man and beast is the conception of an object of worship in the breast of the former. Feuerbach flings in our faces the anthropomorphism of this conception, and tries to make us think we adore our shadow. But with all its human traits it remains always a great being, and powerful enough to be a protector of man. We ever glory in that superior wisdom of Christianity which embodies its disclosures of that Being in two words, — OUR FATHER. Religion asks no more; you may worship Dagon, if you will, benevolent Dagon giving you the plough to till your land, — only be to him a dutiful child. This is the sacred and essential truth of religion, which can never survive a transplanting into the atmosphere of Feuerbach's philosophy.

It would be a great mistake to suppose a man a more *religious* man because his conceptions of spiritual things are clearer than another's. It is not religion that you are able to assure us that the Gueber fire, or the Egyptian snake, or the justice of Calvinism, is not God, or, affirmatively, that he is a spirit of all wisdom and love, of all space and time. The fountain lies higher than that. The truer your conceptions of God, the less idolatrous



you will be, or the less superstitious. But if the fountain above be not fed, there will be no worship to flow from it, and your pure comprehension of God will be but a vain image, before which no knee bows, no heart adores. There will be in your soul a statue of truth, beautiful and chaste in its proportions as the hand of a Praxiteles may chisel, but after all cold and lifeless; a representation in passionless marble of that whose greatest and truest beauty is life and action. The life of religion is the warmth and glow of feeling. The fire of fervid feeling radiates often from that phase of religion which enlightenment calls *superstition*! If superstition be fixed by the amount of knowledge, what is our religion but superstition to the angels, as the religion of birds toward their bird deity would be superstition to us? An infant's religion centres in its parents, and has no thought beyond them. Is not this superstition? Yet it is such perfect religion, that there is nothing left us but to imitate it. Wherever you find the human race, there is the same tendency to religion. Religion is as wide-spread as the atmosphere: it is like the clouds which swathe the whole earth with their moist garments, which send down at the pole the feathering snow-flake, or build up the sharp and glittering pinnacles of the iceberg, but at the equator temper the heat of a sultry sun, and glow in the leaves of the palm and the orange. It adapts itself to all parallels of latitude, and to all periods of time. Here it springs up in one form, there in another. Here it erects altars to Baal, there it kneels between the bare and empty walls of a Puritan church. Here it asks no other temple than the mountain peak, no other God than the golden sun; there it wreathes its spiritual yearnings into the fantastic spires of the Gothic temple, while within the spirit of God speaks through the arches in the peelings of organ-music, and the eye is filled by gorgeous garments and smoking censers, and the heavenly features of "the Mother of God."

Through all these forms there runs the same connecting line; under all these varieties there exists a unanimity. They are all expressions of the same burning want and weakness, they are all the product of a resistless tendency to combine certain attributes, and worship them as an independent being. It is the same cry to



the Father of men which rises on the banks of the Euphrates and the Hudson; amid the din of gongs, or from the minarets of the mosque, or with the solemn bass of the organ. And is the whole human race deceived, and has Feuerbach alone, with his "left wing," found out the illusion?

The two chapters on the nature of man and of religion in general are simply introductory; but religion, in the common sense of the word, is annihilated long before we get through them. We have in them the powder and shot, and we think, with such effective means, a man may knock down for himself; Feuerbach (his name is suggestive of his temper) does it for us in two parts, long and diluted. The first, interspersed with violent philippics against the old automaton, fills by far the larger part. On these two parts the author dwells with some complacency in his preface. He calls them respectively *development* and *battle*. "The development proceeds slowly, swiftly the struggle; for at each station the development is *self-satisfied*, but the struggle only at the end. Thoughtful is the development, but resolute the struggle. The development kindles light, the struggle fire; hence the variety of the two parts." — p. 13.

In accordance with the general principles already laid down, it is shown that the various doctrines of Christianity are natural suggestions of the human soul, and the inference is drawn, that such a religion must be a dream, an illusion. Christianity, to our minds, appeals with justice to her adaptedness to man's position, to her satisfaction of his aspirations in the future, as proofs of her essential truth. We have faith in a religion which assists our development, and contributes to our happiness; faith in the mutual correspondency between that and man, as between the rose, the light, the atmosphere and temperature of a northern climate. But, No! says Feuerbach; you dream, and that very correspondency demonstrates your illusion. What you imagine the gift of a superior wisdom springs spontaneously from your own desires, and you are the victim of a miserable self-deceit. He then lays bare the principles of human nature, and explains the office they have performed in religion. We are taught how the incarnation of God and the idea of God as a sufferer sprang from the wants of the affec-



tionate portion of our nature. God as law, God the Father is the God of the understanding: God as love, God the Son is the God of the heart. We find discussed here, in accordance with the same principle, the doctrines of "the Mother of God," of providence, of miracles, of faith, of regeneration, of celibacy and monasticism, of the Christian heaven and personal immortality. "We have now," says he in closing (p. 253), "reduced the super-earthly, supernatural, and superhuman being of God to the component parts of man's being, as its own component parts. We have in conclusion come back to our beginning. Man is the beginning of religion, man the middle point of religion, man the end of religion."

The second part is a series of thunder-and-lightning chapters, in which Ludwig amuses himself by knocking in pieces our most disjointed structures of theological faith. He demonstrates the *contradiction* in our various doctrines and ceremonies. He has previously shown their natural origin; he now shows them to be essentially false. Blow follows blow, in such rapid succession, that, almost before we have had time to think, we are standing dizzy and bewildered, with the fragments of our old homestead scattered and smoking. We lay aside the book, with a sense of pity for its complete desolation. We feel that it would rob us of much that is dear, and give us nothing in return. We feel, too, that he has dealt unfairly by us. He has dragged up and galvanized doctrines which have been dead for ages; he has harped on points peculiar to sects, and made much show of dogmas which we esteem no part of Christianity. We are safe in saying, that the author of "*Das Wesen des Christenthum*" has studiously avoided discussing that which is commonly regarded by all Christians as the true essence of their religion. He has a specious frankness, which is the most dangerous weapon of a wily man, and a skill which mingles true and false that it may slay the two together. He either misunderstands or wilfully perverts Christianity, and, pretending to treat of its essence, fills his pages with ridicule of the errors that have been appended to it.

When we have protested against the fundamental affirmative doctrine of the book, we are ready to sanction much that follows. The weapons of his satire fall point-



less and harmless among us, for the dogmas aimed at have long been dead. The vigor and power of the attack we admire, and close the book with a conviction of the author's genius. To our minds, it is the sharpest, deepest, and most attractive *exposé* of theological error we have ever seen, and the controversialist may find there a store of weapons which, well used, will prove most effectual against the effete dogmas which burden Christianity.

H. D.

---

ART. VI.—FURNESS'S HISTORY OF JESUS.\*

WHEN, in the year 1836, Mr. Furness published his "Remarks on the Four Gospels," we well remember the delight with which we read those living pages. The book differed from every other work of criticism and commentary on the New Testament in this, that it trembled all over with life, vital in every part. It did not give us dead learning, it did not accumulate the dry details of antiquated criticism, but it seemed as if written by one who had just come from personal intercourse with Jesus himself. The acuteness of its observations illustrated many obscure points of the Gospels. The earnest interest which hung lovingly over every word and act of Jesus often detected what a less loyal and affectionate study had overlooked. Reading the book gave a new sense of reality to the whole of Christ's history. One felt nearer to Jesus, better acquainted with his character, and more intimate with that holy mind, in consequence of these studies of Mr. Furness. Upon those of us, especially, who were then young, this book made a deep impression, and we owe to it a large debt. In fact, like every *live* book, it made an epoch. It excited inquiry, opened new questions, and stirred the earth around the roots of old controversies.

After an interval of fourteen years, Mr. Furness speaks to us again, and again upon his favorite subject. We

---

\* *A History of Jesus.* By W. H. FURNESS. Boston: William Crosby & H. P. Nichols. 1850. pp. 291.



cannot expect a second book like the first. Only once in any man's life is he capable of writing out of such an overflow of thought and feeling. The second book will not make an epoch, but it will throw a steadier, calmer light on many points of interest. It is, as we might expect, written in a more equal, less excited tone. There is as deep an interest in Jesus running through it, and as earnest a desire to engage others in his story. But as in the first work we had the exuberant spring, with its multitudinous blossoms, and the joyous year rising like the ocean-tide around us, so now we have the calm days of autumn, its steady airs, its wide-waving harvests, and its fruits ready to drop into the lifted hand. Mr. Furness has more carefully considered his early theories, — he has fortified some points and abandoned others, — and now presents us in a compact form, not discussions, but results; not investigations, but conclusions.

In the same truth-loving spirit in which the book is written we wish to examine it. And if we devote more of our attention to fault-finding than to merit-finding, it will certainly not be because we undervalue the great merits of the work, but because we think that the times demand the examination of a special question in theology. This is the question of Naturalism and Supernaturalism, a question lying back of most other questions now mooted in theology, — lying behind the discussion of miracles, of the inspiration and authority of the Bible, of sin and salvation, of providence, faith, and prayer. Our view on this pivotal question colors necessarily our views upon these others, and determines necessarily, though often unconsciously, our conclusions concerning them. It is because this seems to us no mere verbal dispute, but a question of real differences of opinion, working a radical divergence of thought, that we think it deserves a new and thorough examination in this periodical.

And since Mr. Furness, with his usual frankness, has in the present work distinctly taken the ground of Naturalism, it seems to us that the notice of his book necessarily involves the examination of this, its fundamental principle, and furnishes a proper occasion for this inquiry. But we will first briefly state what we conceive to be the chief merits and defects of the work.

The merits of this "History of Jesus" are these. It



is a clear, simple narrative of *some* of the events of the life of Jesus. With no show of learning, with no references to commentaries or ancient controversies, it gives us, what is most valuable in learning, a plain and satisfactory solution of vexed questions. Where Mr. Furness has nothing to say, he says nothing. He aims at no totality, at no exhausting analysis. Many events he passes over lightly, many he passes over altogether. He dwells only on what interests him, and this he makes interesting to the reader. And who can say how great is our obligation to the man who can interest us anew in that old story,—who can make words which had become trite even in our childhood fresh with new significance to our mature thought? To remove the dust from the Gospel narrative, so that custom shall not “stale its infinite variety,”—to stamp it anew with the image of perpetual youth,—this surely is a great exploit, and this Mr. Furness has accomplished. It is said that, by the combined efforts of English and Italian lovers of art, a portrait of Dante painted by Giotto has been discovered under the paint, plaster, and dirt of centuries, and has been successfully restored. But how much more do we owe to him who can give us again, not “the starved lineaments of Dante,”\* but the living features of Jesus, rescued from the concealments of association and the deadening influence of that custom, which, says the poet,

“Lies upon us with a weight,  
Heavy as frost, and deep almost as life.”

Especially does Mr. Furness give us the human excellences of the character of Jesus. His book is a new manifestation of the SON OF MAN. In a multitude of instances he indicates the surpassing purity, truth, tenderness, and disinterested love, which appeared in all the life of Christ. Passing by and almost denying the conscious virtue which resulted from every purpose and endeavour, he shows us the goodness which played unconsciously in lambent flames around that divine brow. If goodness be of two kinds, which we may distinguish by such antitheses as inward and outward, intention and action, spirit and beauty, inward principle

---

\* “Never before did I so lively see the starved lineaments of Dante.”  
—Sir Thomas Browne.



and outward development, and so on, — then Mr. Furness has seen and described the latter form of goodness almost exclusively. The goodness of Jesus, in his view, is beauty; is unconscious utterance, naïve expression; is the necessary development of his nature; is not work, but play; is the ripe fruit, not the struggling bud or opening blossom.

And to a certain extent, no doubt, this is true. It is, at best, half the truth. We believe that goodness consists in intention as well as in manifestation, and that the goodness of Jesus was not unconscious, though spontaneous. Still, this side of the character of Jesus has never had justice done to it before. The Church hitherto has been so dazzled by the glory of the Son of God, that it has neglected the beauty of the Son of Man. Mr. Furness has studied so lovingly and faithfully the beauty of the Son of Man, that he has neglected the glory of the Son of God. The personal character of Jesus has so much interested him that he has not seen in him a medium for the transmission of the Divine truth and majesty. Herbert says, that

“A man who looks on glass  
On it may stay his eye;  
Or, if he chooses, *through it* pass,  
And so the heavens espy.”

The Church, hitherto, has chosen to look through the finite to the infinite, and see in Jesus only a manifestation of God. Mr. Furness, on the other hand, stays his eye on the transparent medium itself, and, charmed with its crystal beauty, he does not dwell on what is beyond.

We are afraid, after all, that by these statements and illustrations we have been doing injustice to the view of Mr. Furness. We certainly do not mean to say that Mr. Furness denies the Divinity of Christ, or does not see in him a manifestation of God's truth and law. In a certain sense he admits and teaches both. But that we may not misrepresent him, we will extract the passage in which he states his view of Jesus as a wonderful person, and yet as being on the plane of our common nature.

“At what early age a sense of his great powers began to awaken in him, I cannot tell. That he was most graciously and specially endowed by nature, — a being of extraordinary com-



pleteness and elevation,—that his natural gifts were unprecedented, his whole history shows. Of all born of woman, no one has appeared like him. He represented, not a class or an age, but humanity in its highest form.

“But when I speak of him thus, as one by himself, I would have it distinctly understood, that I do not consider his being as a miracle in any other sense than that in which the being of every man, of every thing, is a miracle. Peculiar, original, as he was, his existence was strictly within the course of nature. There is nothing in nature that forbids—every thing, in fact, authorizes us to look for—every variety of endowment, both in kind and degree, in individuals. There is nothing in nature that renders it impossible for a human being to be born, possessed of all the gifts which Jesus possessed. I believe, therefore, that all the power which he manifested, his intuitive perception of truth, his prophetic insight, that great gift by which, with a simple act of his will, he subdued disease, restored sight to the blind, and called the dead out of their deep sleep, were all native to him; that all these things came just as easily and naturally to him as the most common movements of our limbs do to us.”—pp. 27, 28.

We take this to be a plain statement of the *principle* of naturalism, as opposed to supernaturalism. Now naturalism, as opposed to supernaturalism, is exclusive naturalism. Its principle does not consist in denying miracles. The naturalist may accept all or most of the miracles of the New Testament, as Mr. Furness does, while he explains them as flowing out of the established order of nature. Nor does the principle of naturalism consist in denying the inspiration or authority of the New Testament. For the naturalist may believe in a natural inspiration, and may contend, as Mr. Furness does, that it is found in its very highest degree in the writings of the New Testament, giving them an authority of insight which justifies even the claim of a verbal inspiration.\* Nor does the principle of naturalism con-

---

\* Mr. Furness thinks that the writers were sometimes mistaken. But he says,—“The character of Jesus himself is hardly more fully impressed with truth and nature than these accounts of him which have come down to us. Their authors tell the story with such simplicity, with such unbounded carelessness, with such an entire absence of any thought but of stating facts just as they seemed to them, so all unconscious were they of the True Spirit by which they were animated to their work, that the Life of Jesus, as it is told in the Four Gospels, appears emphatically to have written itself. It is what it is, by no design of their authors; by no human will. These writings ‘grew as grows the grass.’ The old doctrine of



sist in denying the perfect sinlessness and perfect knowledge of Jesus. We may argue that it is in the order of nature that one man should attain this perfection, and contend, as Mr. Furness does, that others might attain it also. Nor, finally, does naturalism consist in denying what are called the "peculiar doctrines" of Christianity, and accepting only the doctrines common to natural religion. The naturalist may accept the church doctrines of the Trinity, total depravity, vicarious atonement, and so forth; but accept them, like the modern Hegelians, as developments of human reason.

"But," it may be asked, "if naturalism can believe in the miracles of the New Testament, can believe in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, in the perfect character of Jesus, and in the church doctrines of orthodoxy, what is its peculiarity, and where is the harm of it?" We answer, that naturalism relates to the principle, and not the substance, of belief. We must look for it behind the facts believed, in the fundamental principle of belief itself. And since we have seen that a man may be a naturalist and yet believe all that the supernaturalist believes, and perhaps more, we admit that there may be no harm to an individual in holding to this system. But in the long run, we believe that, like all other errors, it is sure to produce evil consequences. In the long run it will be sure to shake our belief in all the higher facts and doctrines of the New Testament, to destroy our confidence in the New Testament itself as a trustworthy record, to weaken especially the faith of the world in the divine love and pardoning grace of God, and shake the foundations of a living dependence on the God who hears and answers prayer. Because we believe it an erroneous and defective system, we reject it; because we believe it, in the long run, an injurious system, we oppose it.

All prevailing views on this fundamental question, we believe, may be classed under four divisions, as follows:—1. Exclusive Naturalism. 2. Exclusive Supernaturalism. 3. Supernatural Rationalism. 4. Rational Supernaturalism. Let us examine them briefly, in order.

---

Plenary Inspiration in regard to them comes true after all; and true in a far deeper and more natural sense than has yet been imagined." — p. 235.



## 1. Exclusive Naturalism.

The essential principle of naturalism is this, — that God acts *only* through nature. It is based on the idea of the Divine laws, of the great order of the universe. Its fundamental notion concerning religion is that of development. All progress is the unfolding of germs originally deposited in the creation. Naturalism is so in love with law, that it shrinks from the thought of any new incursion from above into the order of nature. It cannot believe in a God outside of nature, or above nature. Every thing that comes to pass in time is part of the great web of cause and effect which was woven in the beginning. Every thing that happens is the continuation of the old series, the effect of something which went before. Thus, the naturalist must explain the life and works of Jesus as resulting from causes already at work in the world before he entered it, and not as a new descent of the life of God into humanity.

The truth in naturalism is this, — that it recognizes God in nature. Not a bud swells, not a flower opens, not a child is born, not a nation rises and declines, but God is there. The naturalist gladly accepts the great language of Paul, — “From him, and through him, and to him are all things.” “In him we live, and move, and have our being.” God is in the grain which waves broadly over a thousand fields, — God is in the sea which sleeps on the warm, sandy shore of the tropics, or thunders among the grinding icebergs of the polar seas.

The truth in naturalism is also this, — that it recognizes fully that God is not an arbitrary Being, but a God of perfect justice; that he rules by law; that he maintains with steady hand the beneficent order of creation. Without wilfulness and without the shadow of turning, firmly maintaining his great laws, the God of nature infuses into his worshippers the calmness and strength which are in himself. The naturalist has no ecstatic hopes, no sudden fears, no enthusiasm of any kind; he hopes for no magical change in life or at death; he sees that gradation is the law of all progress; he sees that as a man soweth, so doth he also reap, — that God is not unrighteous to forget the smallest work or labor of love, — and that, as not a grain of sand can be lost from the universe, so not a good act or thought can ever fail of its reward.



The defect of naturalism is, that, while it recognizes God as the INFINITE LAW, it does not recognize him also as the INFINITE FREEDOM. It is ignorant that God was not only a creator when the worlds were first made, but is always a creator, — that he must necessarily continue to originate new series, no less than to carry on the old. It not only deprives God of wilfulness, in which it is right, but of will, in which it is wrong, — it not only sees that God is law, but makes him nothing but law. Hence the Deity of the naturalist becomes merely the sum of the laws of the universe, or at best a power, a force, acting according to law. Therefore the personality of God at last vanishes away, and instead of the true pantheism, which teaches that God is *in* all things, we are in danger of the false, which teaches that all things are God.

## 2. Exclusive Supernaturalism.

This system is the antithesis of the former. Its essential principle is this, — that God acts *only* from above nature. It is based on the idea of the Divine will, of God sitting on his throne and ruling by his power for ever. Its fundamental notion concerning religion is that of emanation. Religion is not unfolded out of man's nature, but is a power emanating from God to change man's nature altogether. All progress depends on continued acts of the Divine will. Supernaturalism is so in love with the idea of God's sovereignty, that it cannot bear that it should be limited even by God's wisdom and benevolence. Exalting the Divine will above all law, it makes of it a Divine wilfulness, and substitutes an arbitrary choice in the place of a holy nature. It cannot believe in a God immanent in nature, and calls such a belief Pantheism. Nature, to the supernaturalist, is but a congeries of forces, originally set in motion by God, but disturbed in their operation since by the incursion of evil. Nature is ruined and fallen, and is now no manifestation of God. Some traces of the artist's original design may yet be discerned in its adaptations, but only as we trace the mind of Phidias in the ruins of the Parthenon. God's will, therefore, cannot be discerned in nature, but only in revelation, and revelation is the miraculous interruption of the laws of nature by the direct agency of God. The life and works of Jesus



were accordingly wholly independent of the previous history of the human race, except in Judea. His character was wholly supernatural. While naturalism shows us in Jésus only the Son of Man, supernaturalism makes known to us only the Son of God; and while it maintains the doctrine of two natures in Christ, it virtually sinks the human nature in the Divine, and is ignorant of all his tender human virtues.

The opposition between naturalism and supernaturalism which we have described is not so much a conflict between two systems of opinion as between two tendencies of thought. As all thinkers have been said to be born either Platonists or Aristotelians, so also most men are born either naturalists or supernaturalists. One man has a tendency to reduce all things under law, another to explain events as flowing from free will, from love, from spiritual energy. Few men would accept either system, in its naked and exclusive form, but in each mind there is a secret tendency toward the one or the other. Accordingly, the conflict reappears continually in the history of opinions. The theogonies of ancient Asia were founded on the principle of emanation; those of Europe on that of evolution. The gods of Asia, Brahma and Vishnoo, Ormuzd and Ahriman, were emanations from the absolute. The gods of Greece, Zeus, Ares, Aphrodite, Persephone, were evolved from human attributes, were developments of human nature. Supernaturalism, vindicating the personality and freedom of the Deity from pantheistic tendencies, has appeared from time to time in Judaism and Mohammedanism, in the systems of Augustine and of Calvin. In all these systems God is viewed as a mighty will, above the course of nature. Naturalism, vindicating the wisdom and justice of the Deity from Antinomian tendencies, has appeared in the philosophies of Greece, in the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, and in all the varieties of modern rationalism.

But now we must consider two other forms of opinion, quite prevalent among us, which are founded on an endeavour to reconcile these two exclusive systems. These we have called *supernatural rationalism* and *rational supernaturalism*. In the first, the contents of the



system is rationalism, but its basis and form supernaturalism; in the second, the reverse is the case.\*

### 3. Supernatural Rationalism.

This system accepts the miraculous facts of the Gospels, and considers them as violations of the law of nature, the object of which was to establish religion on an authoritative basis. But the religion thus established is only the religion of reason, as taught by the wisest men of ancient and modern times. It is the republication, with authority, of the religion of nature. It teaches the unity and perfections of God, the moral duties of man, immortality, and retribution in a future life. All that is peculiar, original, and mysterious in Christianity, this system ignores. *Faith* it considers equivalent to the belief of propositions on grounds of evidence, and makes of it an act of the understanding. *Repentance* is not so much an inward change from selfishness to love, as an outward reformation of conduct. *Conversion* is either the accepting of a new creed, the union with a new sect or party, or the outward profession of religion. *Prayer* is an act by which, while addressing God, we create proper feelings and sentiments in our own mind, and so in reality answer our own supplications. *Forgiveness of sin* is an assurance by God that, when we change our conduct and become virtuous, we shall be happy. Such is supernatural rationalism, which is, indeed, not the creed of any sect or party, but is a tendency to be found more or less developed among many sects. Although it has its merits, among which especially is to be remembered its assertion of the rights of the individual reason and conscience in opposition to church authority, it is on the whole a narrow system, which confines the

---

\* Naturalism and rationalism are to be distinguished from each other. They may often be united, but are not necessarily so, and are very different things. The following extract from Tzschirner asserts the distinction strongly. "Rationalism," says he, "is essentially different from naturalism. For naturalism rejects the idea of a supernatural revelation as folly and deception; rationalism, on the other hand, clings to it and maintains it. Naturalism denies the truth of the sacred history; rationalism accepts the facts of Christianity." (Naturalism may accept them too as *natural phenomena*.) "Naturalism treats the Bible as a human book; rationalism treats it as the record of a revelation, and only denies that it is to be unconditionally believed," &c., &c. — Tzschirner, *Memorabilien für das Studium des Predigers*, Band I. Seite 13. The principle of rationalism is to make the reason the ultimate judge of the truth or falsehood of any doctrine, whether of natural or revealed religion.



mind, and excludes many of the noblest convictions which exalt the soul of man.

Let us, then, turn to the consideration of the other system, which seeks to reconcile the truths of supernaturalism and naturalism. This we have called,

#### 4. Rational Supernaturalism.

This system is rational, because it recognizes the rights of reason in their fullest extent. It asserts the duty of using the reason in examining the claims and determining the contents of revelation. Knowing that a man cannot believe what seems to him unreasonable, it does not seek to impose its own belief, by authority, but will wait, as God waits, till its truth commends itself to the inquirer's mind. It is rational, because it accepts nothing on grounds of revelation which is inconsistent with what it believes on other grounds. When the Scripture seems to assert what nature seems to deny, it does not shut its eyes to one class of facts that it may believe the other; but it waits humbly and modestly, till it can either see that one is false, or till the two can be reconciled. But this system is essentially a supernatural faith, for, while believing in nature, it also believes that there is a great deal more above nature,—that there are many things in heaven and earth not dreamt of in our philosophy. It believes the coming of Christ a supernatural event, the introduction into the world of a new power, before not present in human history. Christ's life is not a part of the great *nexus* of events, not an effect, but the commencement of a new and grand order, a spirit descending from above into human affairs to make them all new. The miracles of his life are supernatural, because having their source in this superhuman power; they are natural, because the natural outflow and expression of that power. They are not suspensions of the laws of nature, for then they would be *unnatural*; nor are they, like the phenomena of magic and animal magnetism, the expression of an abnormal and diseased state, for then they would be *preternatural*. But they are strictly *supernatural*, because the coming in of forces, having laws of their own, from a higher world. In that celestial world what are miracles to us may be as natural events as the growing of grass is here. The contents of Christianity, according to this system, are



also strictly supernatural, belonging to an order above that of this world. The object of Christianity was not, as rationalism declares, to teach with authority a system of religious and moral truth, but to communicate a new life to the race. As God flows out into outward nature as law, so he flows into the soul as love. This descent of love into the soul, mediated by Christ, is the new birth, or conversion. It does not come to us as the reward of any goodness or work of ours, but it is the gift of his inexplicable love; yet it is no irresistible force, but works in harmony with the laws of human freedom. This new life, thus strictly supernatural in its origin, natural in its operation, manifests itself by a living faith, a holy love, and believing prayer. *Faith*, in this system, is not the belief of propositions, but the realizing sense of spiritual things. *Prayer*, in this system, is not a mere self-magnetism, but an actual communion with God, who loves to give blessings in this intercourse which would not come by any operation of law.

According to this system, the Christian lives at once in two worlds,—in the world of time and in that of eternity. He has senses and faculties adapted to both. He draws his strength from one, and finds his work in the other. The one is the sphere of labor, duty, effort, morality,—the other is the sphere of joy, freedom, love, piety. He meets God in both worlds. In the world of nature he meets God as the power sustaining and filling all things,—“whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, and the round ocean, and the solid land.”\* In the world of spirit he meets God as the Father and the Friend, who loved him before the foundation of the world, and by whose grace he is saved. He goes to God in the outward world by obedience, God comes to him in the inward world by inspiration. Man takes the initiative in the world of duty. As he sows, so he reaps; he draws nigh to God, and *then* God draws nigh to him. God takes the initiative in the world of grace. Mysterious influences come unasked for to check the sinner and to support the saint; and “herein,” we say, “is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to save us.”

---

\* Wordsworth.



It will be seen that the last system is the one which we approve and love among those we have described. We hope, but are not sure, that our readers generally will agree with us in this preference. All liberal Christians reject the system of exclusive supernaturalism. But some among us lean strongly toward exclusive naturalism, and many, especially among our older theologians, hold views akin to those we have described as supernatural rationalism. At present, however, we have to do with naturalism, and therefore will proceed to give our reasons for thinking that system inadequate, and for accepting the supernatural view of God and Christ.

Admitting, as we do, that God reveals himself in the lives and thoughts of other wise and good men, it may be asked, Why should we wholly separate the revelation made through Jesus from these other revelations? Why not be satisfied with the assertion that Jesus was the ripest fruit of our common nature, — that he became what he was by a transcendent religious genius, — that he was superior to all other men in degree, but not in kind? Why not place him in the same class with Confucius, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates?

Now it will not be denied that there is something in the Christian sentiment, be it habit or be it instinct, which shrinks from these classifications. No matter how much we admire Plato and Antoninus, we feel that they belong to a different order of greatness from that of Jesus. And the difference is just this. We revere in them human genius and human virtue ascending toward the skies; but in Jesus we worship God descending toward the earth. Jesus we are accustomed to regard as an act of God, not as an effort of nature. Humanity did not unfold itself into Jesus as its fairest flower, but that infinite soul of the world, elsewhere hiding himself behind his laws, here shows himself through them. The veil of the temple of nature is rent in twain, and in Jesus a new creative impulse of light and love enters the world. "*Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.*"

This unquestionably has been the view of the Church in all Christian centuries. This is the view which it has attempted to express in its doctrine of the Incarnation. The statement that Jesus was God can, when strictly examined, only mean this. It cannot mean that the



human soul of Jesus, any more than his human body, was God. As a human being, he had a human soul, and was a human person. As a human person, he was finite, limited, dependent. But this human soul was a receptacle for God, and was so filled and overflowed with God, that the finite limitations which existed there disappear in the Infinite. So that when we look elsewhere we see man, when we look at Jesus we see God.

Now this universal belief of the Christian Church is itself a strong argument for the truth of what lies under it. Does a faith like this spring out of the ground? The faith that Christ was the fulness of God is a great phenomenon in human history. How is it to be accounted for? It is an effect for which we must find an adequate cause.

Consider, moreover, the influence of this faith in Christ. It has been the strength of Christian life and Christian effort. Christians, looking to Jesus, have seen in him God's truth, love, and power manifested to redeem mankind; and this has given them power to do and to endure, to become heroes and martyrs in his cause. Would this strength have come from the belief that Jesus, Plato, Paul, and Socrates were fine specimens of natural greatness, and had a genius for truth and goodness? Let the naturalist explain the faith of the Church, and what it has accomplished. Of its theologies concerning Jesus, we think little; but under them all there has been this deep-lying faith, that his life was not merely a growth of nature, but an act of God.

The effect of the life of Christ upon the world also leads us to believe that he differed essentially from all wise and good men. We find in the sacred books of India a lofty spiritualism, akin to that which we find in the New Testament. In the words of Socrates we meet a practical wisdom similar to that expressed in the words of Jesus. The morality of Confucius, of Seneca, of Zoroaster, of Epictetus, are all akin to the morality of the Gospel. But why have not the words of these men passed into the mind and heart of the world? Why do the books of Plato and Seneca lie only on the tables of scholars, while the words of Jesus are repeated by the lips of childhood, are uttered by the bed of the dying, are remembered by the sailor in his stormy midnight-



watch, and remain the last comfort of him from whom all other comfort has fled? The doctrines of Confucius have never passed the boundaries of his nation; the words of Jesus, coming from among the despised Jews, pass the limits of race, institutions, customs, language, law, and form the harmonizing principle which unites in one general culture the most different tribes of men. These are not mere words, not mere thoughts; "they are spirit, and they are life." The life of Christ goes with them, the impulse given to humanity by him constitutes their power. To the most eloquent words we listen, and though thrilled for the moment by their beauty, we presently are our own selves again. But when words come, attended by a fulness of life, they fill the world with their music; they are sunshine in the home of sorrow, they are wreaths of love upon the tomb.

Moreover, the human soul has needs which remain unsatisfied except by a manifestation of God. A longing, often vague, but sometimes uttering itself in distinct words,\* has made men look for some brighter manifestation of God than can be found in the grandeur of outward nature, or the intuitions of human reason.

They have said, — "We are God's children. Will not our Father one day speak to us? There are mysteries from which we cannot escape, questions which he himself has made us ask. Will he not one day give us their solution? We are involved in sin. Shall we ever overcome it, ever escape from it? Those we love best we are every day laying in the ground. Shall we ever see them again? In a few years we shall lie there too. Is that the end, or the beginning? We wish these questions answered, — not intellectually, but experimentally; answered by an experience of our Father's love, by a sense of his forgiving grace, by the consciousness that an eternal life is abiding in us." We believe that Jesus came to answer these questions; practically, to the heart,

---

\* So Confucius announced a religious teacher to come from the West. So Zoroaster predicted the Sosioch, or Mediator, and hence the wide-spread expectation of a great king about to come, prevailing in the East, as Tacitus and Suetonius inform us. So, finally, Socrates hoped that the gods would send a messenger to give a plain account of himself and of our destiny.



not speculatively, to the understanding. The LAW was given by Moses. Divine *laws* were revealed also by Plato, Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Bacon, Newton. But GRACE and TRUTH came by Jesus Christ, and by him alone.

Yet again. Our view of the character of Jesus is confirmed by what he says of himself. Let us try to imagine Socrates, or any other man, however wise and good, using such language about himself as Jesus used. Imagine, if you can, even Paul or John saying these things about themselves, which we have taken, at random almost, from the Gospels.

1. Jesus calls himself "*the only begotten Son of God*."

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoso believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

2. He says he came from God.

"I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me." "I am come in my Father's name." "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "He that sent me is true." "I know him, I am from him, and he sent me." "I go my way to him that sent me."

3. He speaks of his sinlessness and perfect union with God.

"Which of you convinceth me of sin?" "I and my Father are one." "I know God, and keep his saying." "The Father knoweth me, and I know the Father." "The Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that he himself doeth." "Therefore does my Father love me, because I lay down my life for my sheep." "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands."

4. He speaks of himself as having extraordinary authority and powers.

"The Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath." "The Son quickeneth whom he will." "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." "The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself." "I am the light of the world. He that believeth on me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." "I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." "The Son of Man has power



on earth to forgive sins." "All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father," &c. "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father in heaven." "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord," &c. "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." "He breathed on them and said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me shall never die." "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

Now it seems clear that no one could have spoken of himself in this way, who considered himself as not differing essentially from wise and good men. It argued in Jesus either a fanatical self-esteem, or a consciousness of divinity, to use such language as this. His whole life, teaching, character, influence on the world, make it impossible to believe him a fanatic, or an enthusiast. The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable, that he had this peculiar mission, this great work to do, — that he was not the Son of God merely by personal fidelity, but by Divine selection and endowment. If he was merely one who, by obedience to his instinct of duty, had purified his character and made for himself a spotless virtue, the whole class of texts we have quoted would become unintelligible, and he would have spoken of himself, too, in a very different manner, with terms and phrases suited to express the virtues of a self-formed character.

We return from this examination of the underlying principle of Mr. Furness's work, to the consideration of its details. Mr. Furness accepts the facts recorded in the Gospels as substantially true, but reserves the right of critically examining each, to see whether it involves a miracle or not. In this he adopts a method common to all interpreters. He considers some of the statements of the New Testament writers erroneous or fictitious. Herein he follows the course common to many distinguished interpreters of the liberal school. If he applies his principle more sweepingly than others, and rejects some facts which most of us would think it reasonable to retain, we have no reason to find fault with him, but, by a more careful exegesis, must endeavour to reëstablish their authority and value.



Mr. Furness says (page 197), — "That there may be a mixture of the fabulous in the history of Jesus, I do not deny, I admit to a certain extent. It would be strange were it not so. But still, that the story, substantially, in regard to all the principal facts, should be fictitious, is just as impossible as that we should be able to imagine a new creature."

The following events in the life of Jesus Mr. Furness so explains as to discharge the miraculous element, and change them into commonplace phenomena. The immaculate conception he considers a mistake, founded on some dreams of Mary (p. 20). Jesus was the Son of Mary and Joseph (p. 25). The Holy Ghost, descending like a dove, was an inward purpose of the soul of Jesus, accompanied with the outward fact of a dove flying by (p. 44). The temptations in the wilderness were reflections in his own mind upon the use he might make of his remarkable powers (p. 48). His prophecies proceeded from great sagacity and foresight, but he did not foresee all the great obstructions which would hinder the progress of the truth (p. 85). His cures were wrought partly by a special power of healing, and partly by the faith he inspired in those who came to be healed (p. 34). Practically, however, Mr. Furness seems to attribute the cures chiefly to the faith of the patients, and seems sometimes to assume a little too readily, that, addressed by Jesus in a tone of authority, the cure of the sufferers must have followed as a matter of course. Thus he says of the insane man (p. 71), of whom faith could hardly be predicated, that, being "personally addressed, and with an air of unearthly authority, . . . .no doubt from that moment he regained his self-possession completely." He supposes that the centurion's child had caught his father's faith, and that the expectation of seeing the wonder-worker would cure his palsy very naturally. "He must needs have got well." So of the woman who touched him. The touch cured her in a natural way. It was "no medical efficacy in his clothes, but the person's own faith, which wrought the cure." "The touch must have been to her like an electric stroke." (p. 91.) In short, she cured herself. Even in the case of Lazarus, whom Mr. Furness supposes to have been really dead, it was the faith of the dead man which enabled



him to be brought to life again (p. 199). So of the young persons whom he raised from death. We are not told of their having any faith in Jesus, but Mr. Furness says that their *youth* supplied the absence of it, for "between him and the young there was a living sympathy. They were in the same sphere." (p. 200.) And, believing fully in the resurrection of Jesus himself, he thinks that he woke to life again "by the native force of his mighty God-inspired being, prompted to this unprecedented act by the love he bore his disciples, and by his interest in the truth, with which his inmost life was identified. That reanimated his lifeless body." (p. 287.)

Now, if we were disposed to criticize these statements and explanations, we should perhaps dissent, more or less, from all of them. We have no doubt that Mr. Furness has struck a vein of truth, in supposing that miracles have their laws and conditions, but we think he overvalues his explanations. But these questions have been so often argued, and need for their discussion so much more minute and accurate a criticism than would be proper here, that we pass them by with these few words.

And now gladly do we return, after our necessary protest, to sit at the feet of our poet, and listen to the music of his strain, while in glowing words he sounds the praises of his great Master. Through the long summer afternoon, while the shadows of the trees are lengthening around us, we could listen well content to that earnest exposition of the loftiest theme on which the human mind can dwell. The love of Mr. Furness for the beautiful and true, in all domains of nature and art, fits him well for the high discussion. Dissenting from him in a great principle, and in details, we feel wiser and better for having heard him. His "History of Jesus" is not the final word on this matter, but it is fitly spoken, and spoken in season, and will awaken to a deeper thought multitudes of kindred minds.

J. F. C.

---



ART. VII. — LITURGICAL AND EXTEMPORANEOUS  
WORSHIP.\*

THE Unitarian denomination has, from its origin, in this country, enjoyed the advantages of both modes of religious worship, the liturgical and the extemporaneous. Dr. Freeman, the earliest pastor of any church who avowed himself a Unitarian, had been educated as a minister of the Episcopal Church, and retained his preference for the liturgical method of worship, and continued to use the Book of Common Prayer after the change of his religious sentiments and those of his people, and the alterations in the service which that change of opinion rendered necessary. But the clergymen and churches which sympathized most nearly with him, and which successively avowed Unitarian sentiments, were of those who had been accustomed to the extemporaneous method, the method introduced by the Pilgrims, and all but universally in use in New England. This difference of forms in Unitarian worship produced no disagreement in sentiment; but, on the contrary, by gradually bringing each class of worshippers into familiarity with the mode practised by the other, taught them a proper estimate of forms, as important only so far as they were efficient in nourishing the sentiment of devotion. Thus gradually those prejudices which once alienated the Churchman and the Puritan, and led each to abhor his brother's mode of worship, gave way; and the ear accustomed to the prayer-book might often trace its rich devotional phraseology interwoven in the texture of the extemporaneous service; while, on the other hand, each successive edition of King's Chapel Liturgy gives evidence of renewed attempts to adapt more and more the fixed form to varying circumstances. Further indications of the same tendency are exhibited in the adoption by two societies in this city, and by one at St.

---

\* 1. *Book of Common Prayer, according to the Use of King's Chapel.* Boston. 1850.

2. *A Manual of Prayer for Public or Private Worship.* St. Louis, Mo. 1842.

3. *Service Book, for the Use of the Church of the Disciples.* Boston. 1844.

4. *Service Book for the Church of the Saviour.* 1846.

5. *The Christian Liturgy and Book of Common Prayer, &c., &c.* 1847.



Louis, of a mode compounded of the liturgical and the extemporaneous. We would now treat the subject, as far as possible, with impartiality, as one which Christians may properly discuss. Each of these methods has its peculiar advantages and disadvantages. In order to judge in what cases each is preferable, let us reflect for a moment on the distinction between common and proper or occasional prayer.

Common prayer applies to those things which are common to all men; proper prayer to those which are peculiar to each individual. Common prayer is for all times; proper prayer is for special emergencies. Common prayer is calm, thoughtful, comprehensive; proper prayer is ardent, specific, personal. Common prayer is enduring, special prayer is temporary. Common prayer may therefore fitly hold a fixed form, while special prayer varies its utterance with the occasion. To Christians who assemble, on every returning Sabbath, for united worship, a form may furnish an appropriate vehicle for their common devotions; but for missionary purposes, and to rouse the impenitent and thoughtless, it is less adapted. We have seen an engraving representing the scene of "The First Prayer in Congress." When we reflect that Bishop White, who officiated on that occasion, would not probably have allowed himself to use any prayer but those in the volume which is open before him, we cannot but feel how much less touching such must have been, than one that the occasion would have called forth from a heart as warm and true as his, if left to its own utterances. On the other hand, any one who has observed the irksome effort of some painful or hesitating speaker in extemporaneous prayer, in common Sunday worship, so to go over the familiar topics as to give them apparent variety, and not to repeat himself, while half his mind is in active exercise to select his language, and only the other half is at liberty to contemplate his theme, will be disposed to ask, Where is the expediency of requiring variety of expression for uniformity of topics, and, when all the conditions of teacher, people, and theme remain the same, of attempting to give variety to the language in which the petition is laid before the throne?

But it is not our intention to discuss so wide a subject



as the comparative merits of the two methods of public religious worship, satisfied as we are that each possesses advantages of its own. But as our topic is the new edition of the "Book of Common Prayer, according to the Use of King's Chapel, Boston," we will briefly name one or two considerations, which appear to us to show the peculiar appropriateness of such a book, at this time, to the religious condition of our country, while we leave unquestioned the advantages of the prevailing method of worship. If we seem to speak in the character of an advocate, the same pages are free to others.

It is a book, then, which may be used by Christians of every name, without jarring harshly on the feelings of any. As says the preface,—

"The Trinitarian, the Unitarian, the Calvinist, the Arminian, will read nothing in it which can give him any reasonable umbrage. God is the sole object of worship in these prayers; and as no man can come to God but by the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, every petition is here offered in his name, in obedience to his positive command." — p. vi.

It omits allusions to disputed doctrines. Thus, what is retained is of the character best suited to nourish devotion, and it is left to those who use the book to supply its omissions, if they think necessary, from other sources.

In a country so wide as ours, so thinly peopled, where little clusters of inhabitants often find themselves separated from other neighbourhoods by distances which preclude resorting to any place of worship, much less such a one as each would prefer, how useful it would be, if a book of religious worship could be adopted, that would enable any respectable individual to conduct the common prayers of such a circle, with propriety and solemnity, preserving also those associations with the services of their early days and former homes, which would cling around the prayer-book to which they had been accustomed.

These associations which cluster round a book of common prayer are of themselves a strong argument in its favor. As the religious affections of the traveller glow warmer when he treads the plains of Galilee and the hills of Jerusalem, kindled by the associations of the place,—as the picture or the relic of a departed friend



appeals in like manner to the heart, — so the prayer-book of our childhood speaks to our religious sensibilities. “The child reads the same page which his parents once read, and his devotions are warmed and hallowed by his remembrance of the affection and the faith of those who may have been called from the worship of an earthly temple to a holier worship in heaven.” (Preface, p. ix.) Of course we would not press this argument to the disparagement of the Bible, though we add to it another object of affectionate remembrances. Can religion afford to dispense with an aid so efficacious as this? Can those of the risen generation, who see the young passing off in crowds to the tempting regions of the West, be insensible to the value of such a safeguard to the impressions and instructions of the past?

The use of forms of prayer is traced back to the times of the Apostles, by Burnet, the historian of the Reformation, who tells us, — “In the primitive Church, when the extraordinary gifts ceased, the bishops of the several churches put their offices and prayers into such a method as was nearest to what they had heard and remembered from the Apostles.” There are not lacking, however, the best authorities to prove that the earliest Christian worship was extemporaneous. When the Reformation was introduced into England, there were in use, in different parts of the kingdom, various liturgies, more or less differing from one another, and designated by the name of the cathedral or county in which they were received. These were distinguished from each other as the “Use” of Sarum, of York, &c. In the year 1547, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Ridley, with eleven other eminent divines, were commissioned to compile a uniform service-book, for the use of the whole kingdom. This work they fulfilled, and compiled the “Book of Common Prayer,” chiefly on the basis of the “Use of Sarum,” or Salisbury Cathedral, the form most generally employed at that time.

On the accession of Queen Mary, the Roman Catholic religion was reëstablished, the Book of Common Prayer suppressed, and Cranmer and Ridley, its authors, were burned at the stake.

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, in 1559, the



Book of Common Prayer was restored, and confirmed by Parliament. Slight amendments were made in it at that time, and afterwards in the reigns of James the First and Charles the Second. The Epistles and Gospels were taken out of the last translation of the Bible, (the present received version,) but the Psalms were retained in the "old translation." The whole Liturgy was brought to the state in which it now stands in the English Church, and in which it stood in the American Episcopal churches, including that of King's Chapel, Boston, at the time of our national Revolution.

For fifty years after the first settlement of the Colony of Massachusetts, our fathers had successfully resisted the introduction of Episcopal worship. But on the restoration of the Stuart dynasty, the royal will was announced in terms no longer to be evaded, and a toleration of Episcopal worship was conceded, with extreme reluctance. Still, it was not till 1686 that the first Episcopal church in New England was founded, under the name of "King's Chapel." The first edifice was small and of wood; but in 1749 it was replaced with a granite edifice, now standing, after the lapse of a century, with no marks of dilapidation or decay.

In the period immediately preceding the American Revolution, the church of King's Chapel was in a state of great prosperity. It was the government church. Thither resorted the governor of the Province, the admiral of the naval forces on this station, and, in general, all those connected with the government, both officially and by social intercourse. The Revolution effected an immediate change. In March, 1776, the British troops evacuated Boston, and Dr. Caner, the clergyman of King's Chapel, went with them. The congregation was dispersed, and the church was closed. It was not reopened, for Episcopal worship, till the end of the war, when those of the proprietors who had remained in the country took measures to that effect. On the 21st of April, 1783, the Rev. James Freeman was chosen its pastor, and regular services were resumed.

The political changes which had taken place rendered necessary some alterations in the prayer-book. Those parts of it which recognized the royal government could of course no longer be used.



"But much greater alterations were suggested by Mr. Freeman, whose opinions, in the course of a year or two, underwent some important changes, and who then found that some parts of the Liturgy were so inconsistent with the faith which he derived from the Scriptures, that he resolved no longer to read such portions, and to propose to his society an amended form of prayer for public use at the Chapel."

"Mr. Freeman's suggestions were considered by his people. He 'preached a series of doctrinal sermons to them, and, by the aid and influence of the word of God, moved them to respond to his sentiments.' The result was, that on the 19th of June, 1785, the proprietors voted, 'that the Common Prayer, as it now stands amended, be adopted by this church, as the form of prayer to be used in future by this church and congregation.' " \*

The changes made in the Liturgy by Dr. Freeman were for the most part of such portions as involved the doctrine of the Trinity. In great part, the omissions were of passages not taken from the Bible, while Scriptural sentences were introduced in their places. The Athanasian and Nicene Creeds were omitted, and those passages in the Litany, collects, and prayers, which contained direct addresses to any other being than God, the Father, were omitted or altered. With what judgment and discretion this was done may be seen by examining the old and the new form of the Litany, which we present below, in parallel columns. We have not thought it necessary to print the responses.

#### THE LITANY, OR GENERAL SUPPLICATION,

*According to the Use of the  
Episcopal Church.*

O God, the Father of heaven, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners.

O God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners.

O God, the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have mercy upon us, &c.

*According to the Use of King's  
Chapel.*

O God, our Heavenly Father, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners.

O God, who by thy Son hast redeemed the world, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners.

O God, who by thy holy Spirit dost govern, direct, and sanctify the hearts of thy faithful servants, have mercy, &c.

---

\* Greenwood's History of King's Chapel.



O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons and one God, have mercy, &c.

(*Omitted.*)

Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers, neither take thou vengeance of our sins : spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed by thy most precious blood, and be not angry with us for ever.

Remember not, Lord, our offences, neither take thou vengeance of our sins : spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed by the most precious blood of thy Son, and be not angry with us for ever.

From all evil and mischief, from sin ; from the crafts and assaults of the devil ; from thy wrath and from everlasting damnation ;

From all evil and mischief, from sin ; from the assaults of temptation ; from thy wrath and from everlasting destruction ;

*People.* Good Lord, deliver us.

*People.* Good Lord, deliver us.

The rest of the Litany is retained, with but little alteration ; but the sentence beginning, " By the mystery of thy holy incarnation," and the next, are omitted. These, on the whole, are the most serious and noticeable of all the alterations, in the usual Sunday service, introduced by Mr. Freeman. We think our readers will admit that they were made with discretion.

It is not to be denied that our fathers, the Puritans, entertained strong objections to the use of a form of prayer. It will appear, however, to the attentive reader of their history, that this feeling owed its intensity to the very cause of whose strength we have spoken above. It was associated in their minds with the persecuting hierarchy and government of England. In principle, many of the early Reformers approved of the use of a form of prayer ; \* in proof of which the authority of Calvin is sufficient, who says, "*Publicam formulam precum et rituum Ecclesiasticorum valde probo, ut certa illa extet, a quâ ne pastoribus discedere, in functione suâ, liceat.*" † Neither did the Puritans disapprove of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, as a whole ; they

\* " They did not object against prescribed forms of prayer, provided a latitude was indulged the minister to alter or vary some expressions, and to make use of a prayer of his own conception before and after sermon." Neal's History of the Puritans, Vol. I. chap. 8.

† Quoted in Tayler's "Retrospect of the Religious Life of England," page 487.



took exception to parts thereof, and defined clearly the modifications they desired. Some of these causes of exception have disappeared, with the lapse of time and change of circumstances; some, we may safely admit, as we view them in the light of the present day, were made of undue importance; and the remainder, all, we believe, without exception, have been removed in this amended liturgy. Neal tells us,—"When the king was in progress to London, April, 1603, the Puritans presented their 'millenary petition,' so called because it was said to be subscribed by a thousand hands."\* It asked relief in the following particulars, relating to the Church service:—"That the cross in baptism, the interrogatories to infants, baptism by women, and confirmation, may be taken away, that the cope and surplice may not be urged, that the ring in marriage may be dispensed with, that the service may be abridged." They afterwards added a complaint of the old translation of the Scriptures being retained in the prayer-book, and of the use of organs in churches.

We have space to comment on a few only of these petitions and complaints. It may puzzle some of our readers to imagine what is meant by "interrogatories to infants," and surprise them quite as much to learn that the practice of interrogating the infant, when brought for baptism, as to his belief in the creed, and his wish to be baptized, not only was, but is, in use in the English Church,—nay, more, continues in use in the Episcopal Church in this country to the present day. It is true, the questions are said, in the Rubric, to be addressed to the sponsors; but that they are really addressed to the child is evident from the closing ones,—“Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?” with the answer, “That is my desire”; and the next, “Wilt thou then obediently keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?” Answer, “I will, by God’s help.” We need hardly say this is amended in the King’s Chapel Liturgy.

“Baptism by women” seems to have been a great grief to our fathers. It probably sprung from the peculiar notions respecting the efficacy of that rite for regen-

---

\* History of the Puritans, Vol. II. chap. 1.



eration, which are, at this very time, distracting the Church of England, and according to which the rite was equally efficacious, however performed, whether in the sick-room, and by ignorant menials, or with all the ceremonies of the Church, and by its dignified clergy. We are not aware that this practice ever prevailed in this country.

"Confirmation" is a proper sequel to "interrogatories to infants in baptism." When these are dispensed with, the other may be omitted. There was another objection our fathers had to confirmation, in the superstitious notions attached to the "laying on of hands." Yet confirmation is a pleasing and suggestive service, and might, it appears to us, be restored, somewhat modified, with good effect. The service is not in the Liturgy of King's Chapel.

"The use of organs in public worship." We can hardly realize the hostility that our fathers entertained to this practice; but it was not slight nor transient. Common as organs are now, in churches of every denomination, not excepting those which cherish the most indiscriminating adherence to the Puritan model, it will hardly be believed that the date of the introduction of the first organ into Congregational worship was so recent as 1790, when the society of Brattle Street procured one. The records of that church, under date of July 24, 1713, show that a legacy of the Rev. W. Brattle, "of a pair of organs," — meaning no more than what we now-a-days call an organ, — was respectfully declined, on the ground "that they did not think it proper to use the same in the public worship of God."\*

The use of the old translation of the Psalms is the remaining point of exception. It continues to this day in the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church. The version is that of Coverdale, 1535. How early this was, in the history of the English language, it will aid us to appreciate, if we remember that it was anterior to all the great names of English literature, with

---

\* Rev. J. G. Palfrey's "Sermon, with Notes Historical and Biographical," 1825. Another fact, derived from the same authority, will show the length to which the early settlers carried their dislike of the Church of England and its practices. "The reading of the Scriptures and the use of the Lord's prayer were banished from the public services, because they were embraced in the prelatical forms."



the exception of Chaucer. It is, therefore, not surprising that the language of the Psalms, in this version, should be sometimes obscure, and sometimes offensive to modern taste. Neither is it wonderful that, at that early day of philological learning, mistakes in rendering the meaning should have sometimes taken place, which subsequent inquiries have corrected. The version of our Bible is well known to be that of King James, published in 1611, three quarters of a century after Coverdale's, and after numerous intervening attempts, each of which had doubtless done something towards supplying the deficiencies of the first.

After weighing these facts, the wonder is, not that the Bible version should be on the whole superior to that of the prayer-book, but that the latter should so well sustain a comparison with it. Indeed, in some places it may challenge superiority; and as we see it in our Liturgy, amended freely, where defective, from the Bible readings and other trustworthy sources, we own that we prefer it.

The fact is, that both these versions are very defective. Passages imperfectly rendered are so numerous, that great injustice is done to the compositions themselves,—injustice under which, we firmly believe, no poetry but that of the Bible could have retained its hold on our taste and feelings. It is a remarkable fact, that while scholars are never weary, and the public never satisfied, with attempts to elucidate the text and improve the versions of the profane poets, there should be such a general acquiescence in the very imperfect state, in these respects, of our sacred books. What, for instance, can be the meaning of this sentence, which is read in the Episcopal Church every time the morning prayer for the eleventh day of the month comes round? Psalm lviii. 8, "Or ever your pots be made hot with thorns, so let indignation vex him, even as a thing that is raw." Of this verse the Bible version is as follows:—"Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in his wrath." Dr. Noyes, in his excellent version of the Psalms, informs us that the allusion is to the culinary operations of the people in the open air. He translates it, "Before your pots feel the heat of the thorns, whether fresh or burning, may they



be blown away." It is a proverb, intended to represent the defeat of the plans of the wicked before they can be consummated. Again, in Psalm lxviii. 30, the prayer-book version reads, "When the company of the spearmen and multitude of the mighty are scattered abroad among the beasts of the people," &c. The Bible version is, "Rebuke the company of spearmen, the multitude of the bulls, with the calves of the people," &c. Dr. Noyes renders the first clause, "Rebuke the wild beast of the reeds," which "wild beast of the reeds" he supposes to be the crocodile, the emblem of Egypt, an allusion worthy of a poet; while the "bulls and the calves" may denote powerful nations and those of inferior strength, or commanders and their soldiers.

The theme of the 73d Psalm is the "prosperity of the wicked." "They are in no distress, but are firm and strong," &c. "And this is the cause that they are so lifted up with pride, and filled with cruelty." Then the Psalmist adds, in the prayer-book version, "Therefore fall the people unto them, and thereout suck they no small advantage." The Bible version gives it, "Therefore his people return hither, and waters of a full cup are wrung out to them." Dr. Noyes's version is, "Therefore his people walk in their ways, and there drink from full fountains."

These specimens will show that our fathers did not complain of the prayer-book version without cause, and that the Bible version, if substituted, would hardly suffice to remove every defect. The course which has been pursued in the Chapel Liturgy is to retain the old version as the basis, amending it from the Bible version, and both, if need be, by the aid of modern scholarship. The Psalter here given professes to be but a selection from the Psalms, and the liberty has been freely exercised of omitting whole psalms and parts of psalms which were judged less appropriate to Christian worship. Others, which are selected as proper psalms for special occasions, such as Christmas and Easter, have been printed with the services for those days, and not in the body of the psalms. Thus, the whole bulk of the Psalter has been reduced about one third, and the service proportionately abridged.

This seems to be, upon the whole, the best way of



dealing with a difficulty which has always been felt, in using these divine poems, in public worship. It was felt, as Bishop Burnet tells us, when the first edition of the English Liturgy came out, in 1549. It may be traced in the comments of defenders and critics of that Liturgy ever since. It will be curious, and we hope interesting to our readers, to examine some of the modern service-books, whose titles we have given at the head of this article, and see how they have dealt with this department.

It is a question that meets us at the threshold, in attempting the adaptation of these Jewish poems to Christian worship, how far those portions which relate to Jewish history should be retained. There are those who, conceiving every word and sentence to be divinely inspired, would say, "Retain the whole, however obscure or inappropriate any part may seem to be"; but our readers are not of that class. There are others who would except to every thing of a local and temporary character, as having nothing to do with us. "What concern have we," they say, "with David's victories or Solomon's wife, with the city of Jerusalem or the waters of Babylon?" It would take too much time and space to discuss this question here, but one thing may be urged in a few words. Jewish antiquities are Christian antiquities, and whatever makes us more familiar with the character and fortunes of the Jewish race, before the times of our Saviour, makes us more familiar with the course of events that led to him. His mind was formed, so far as it was formed by human influences, by the condition of things around him, which was the result of the long chain of events from Abraham downwards; and these are the subject of the allusions to which we refer. They are, therefore, surely not unworthy of the contemplation of Christians, nor unsuited to supply aliment to their devotions.

The opposite plan deprives the Psalms of the element of *personality*, and thereby robs them of that which gives them much of their attractiveness and poetry. They become mere abstract expressions of thoughts and emotions, with the thinking and the feeling individual withdrawn from sight. The proper medium is, no doubt, the object to be aimed at. Let us see how far it has been attained in the volumes before us.



There are four service-books, whose titles we have given at the head of this article. They are those in use by the Church of the Saviour (Mr. Waterston's), the Church of the Disciples (Mr. Clarke's), Mr. Eliot's society at St. Louis, and the Liturgy of Mr. Sears, prepared by that gentleman as an attempt "to erect a broad platform of religious opinion, on which Christians may stand in amity," &c. For facility of reference we shall call them by the names of the gentlemen who use, and who, we presume, compiled them.

Mr. Clarke, in his arrangement of the Psalms, has pursued nearly the plan of the King's Chapel Liturgy, but with greater abridgment and omission. He and Mr. Waterston have made the Bible version the basis, Mr. Sears retaining the prayer-book version. Mr. Eliot omits the Psalms altogether.

Mr. Waterston and Mr. Sears have taken the liberty of blending the Psalms with one another, and cutting them up into portions of desired lengths, to which they give the name of "Selections." This is a mode of treating the works of a poet, which, we presume, was never practised in the case of any other bard, ancient or modern. Whatever the share of inspiration that may be considered to have fallen to the lot of the bard, he is usually thought competent to decide, without appeal, as to what portion of his strains shall stand by itself, as one production, whether struck off at one impulse, or elaborated at frequent sittings. No critic, that we are aware of, has ever presumed to dictate to Horace that two or more of his shorter Odes might well be amalgamated into one, nor ventured to cut out the dull part of two of Virgil's Eclogues, and make one brilliant one of the remnants. But King David is, not in this respect only, the most ill-used of poets. He seems to have been a victim from the days of Sternhold and Hopkins until now.

And why is this? It is not because men do not appreciate his poetic excellences. On the contrary, no poet has ever called forth higher eulogies from all who have hearts to feel and taste to appreciate. Why is it, then, that such violent and unscrupulous hands have been laid upon his works? Principally, we believe, on account of the bad translations of them. There are



abundant passages in the Psalms, so clear in their meaning, so connected in themselves, that no translation can disguise them. Yet, of another large portion, is it not true that they are viewed by many of those who habitually read them as mere strings of pious apothegms, without connection or purpose? In this light our two compilers, at least, seem to have regarded them. Let us take the 29th Psalm as a specimen. We will borrow the commentary upon it from an "Essay on the Literary Attractions of the Bible," by Rev. James Hamilton, London.\*

"There is no phenomenon in nature so awful as a thunder-storm, and almost every poet, from Homer and Virgil to Dante and Milton, has described it. In the Bible, too, we have, in the 29th Psalm, a description of a thunder-storm, which, rising from the Mediterranean, and travelling by Lebanon and along the inland mountains, reaches Jerusalem, and sends the people into the temple porticos for refuge. And besides those touches of terror, in which the geographical progress of the tornado is described, it derives a sacred vitality from the presence of Jehovah in each successive peal. 'The voice of the Lord is on the sea, the God of glory thundereth; the Lord is on the mighty sea. The voice of the Lord is powerful, the voice of the Lord is full of majesty. The voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars,\* yea, the Lord breaketh the cedars of Lebanon. The voice of the Lord divideth the flames of fire [lightnings]; the voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness; yea, the Lord shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh. In his temple doth every one speak of his glory. The Lord sitteth upon the water-flood; [and now the sun shines out again;] the Lord will give his people the blessing of peace.'"

Now let us see how our compilers have dealt with this psalm. Mr. Clarke omits all those verses which describe the origin and progress of the storm, except one, and in that one the allusion to the Mediterranean is lost by a faulty translation, "is upon many waters," — rendered in the above extract "mighty sea"; in King's Chapel prayer-book, "thundereth over the great waters." Mr. Clarke omits the verses which trace the progress of the storm over Lebanon and the wilderness at its base, the out-flashing lightning and the breaking of the cedars, the awestruck group in the temple, and the water-flood, caused by the torrents, that, rushing from the hills, fill the

---

\* Published as a tract by the American Tract Society, 1850.



ravines around the holy city. In fact, he retains only those which convey an indefinite impression of power and majesty, but suggest no particular manifestation of those qualities. Mr. Waterston treats it in the same manner.

The treatment of the 42d Psalm will also show the effect of the expunging and reconstructing process. Of this psalm Dr. Noyes says, — "For beauty of imagery, depth and naturalness of religious feeling, and the very striking manner in which the voice of religion in the poet's inmost soul is heard in the refrains, stilling the tempest of anxiety and grief, this psalm is so admirable, that it probably has no superior in any language." It is the utterance of the feelings of a pious worshipper of the only true God, when, in exile and among the enemies of his religion, he pours out his regrets for the privileges of religious worship, from which he is debarred. It must be remembered that the Jews attached an importance to the *place* of worship, — "to pay their vows in Jerusalem," — almost beyond the conception of Christians at the present day.

Let us conceive of a well-nurtured youth, from some New England village, an adventurer in California, and, sick of the ribaldry and license of the present scene and companions, perhaps on some unnoticed and unhonored Sunday, in the solitude of his tent, giving utterance to his feelings in words like these: —

"As the hart panteth for the water-brooks, so longeth my soul for thee, O God!

"My soul is athirst for God; yea, even for the living God. When shall I come and appear before God [in his sanctuary]?

"My tears have been my food day and night, while they continually say unto me, Where is now thy God?

"When I remember these things, I pour out my soul in grief; how I once walked with the multitude to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with the multitude that kept holy-day.

"Why art thou so full of heaviness, O my soul? and why art thou so disquieted within me?

"Put thy trust in God, for I will yet give him thanks for the help of his countenance.

"Once the Lord granted his loving-kindness in the day-time; and in the night-season did I sing unto him, and made my prayer unto the God of my life.



“ Now I say unto the God of my strength, Why hast thou forgotten me? why go I thus heavily, while the enemy oppresseth me?

“ Why-art thou so cast down, O my soul, and why art thou so disquieted within me? O, put thy trust in God, for I will yet thank him, who is the help of my countenance, and my God.” — *King's Chapel Liturgy*, p. 318.

Let us see how this psalm is treated in the books before us. In Mr. Waterston's (Selection 28), the third and fourth verses, which explain the cause of the poet's sadness, are omitted, and we are left to imagine such cause as we please. Several other verses are omitted, and, to make out the suitable length for a “ Selection,” it is pieced out with a portion of the 46th Psalm, the tenor of which may be judged of by the title which Noyes gives it, — “ Thanksgiving for victory over enemies, and trust in God as a national refuge and defence.” Mr. Clarke treats the psalm in the same manner, except that he prints it by itself, and does not amalgamate it with any other. Mr. Sears (Day VIII., Evening), seeing no beauty in the allusion to the hart panting for the water-brooks, leaves out that verse, and begins with the second. He leaves out the third and fourth, and then brings in the refrain, “ Why art thou so full of heaviness, O my soul,” &c.; and no sooner has he finished this, than, omitting the intervening strophe, he gives it again, so that the fifth and sixth verses are a repetition of the third and fourth.

Of the 104th Psalm, the author of the “ Pleasures of Hope ” says, — “ The impression of that exquisite ode dilates the heart with a pleasure too instinctive and simple to be described.” Mr. Clarke gives the whole of it. In the third verse there are two errors of grammar, which he has made by changing the pronoun “ his ” to “ thy.” Mr. Waterston does nearly the same, but avoids the grammatical error. Both retain a mistranslation of the fourth verse, which is corrected in the *King's Chapel Liturgy*.

Mr. Sears seems not to have esteemed this “ exquisite ode ” so highly as Mr. Campbell. He gives but eight verses of the thirty-five of which it is composed, and has not been so careful in his excisions as to avoid ugly chasms. For instance, in the fourth verse he tells us, “ He maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flaming



fire"; and in the next we read, "At thy rebuke they flee; at the voice of thy thunder they are afraid." This seems strange to be said of angels, but the next verse and the following do not clear up the difficulty. "They go up as high as the hills, and down to the valleys beneath. Thou hast set them their bounds that they shall not pass, neither turn again to cover the earth." All which the Psalmist applied to the waters, not to the angels. But Mr. Sears has left out the verses which show the change of subject.

The 50th Psalm is ascribed to Asaph. "It is enough," says Dr. Noyes, "to place him in the number of poets of the very first order." "The author was," says Eichhorn, "one of those ancient wise men who felt the insufficiency of external religious usages, and urged the necessity of cultivating virtue and purity of mind." It commences with a "sublime theophany," in which Jehovah is announced as speaking from Zion, his chosen seat, while heaven and earth are called to witness, and the host of worshippers is addressed:—

"The Lord, even the most mighty God, hath spoken, and called the world, from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof.

"Gather my servants together unto me, those who have made a covenant with me with sacrifice."

"And the heavens shall declare his righteousness, for God is judge himself."

The worthlessness of mere sacrifices is then declared:—

"I will take no bullock out of thine house, nor he-goat out of thy fold; for all the beasts of the forest are mine, and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills."

Reproof is then dealt out to the moral offender, who hopes to hide his guilt under a parade of religious observances:—

"Unto the ungodly saith God, 'Why dost thou preach my laws, and take my covenant in thy mouth, whereas thou hatest instruction, and hast cast my words behind thee?'"

Then follows the conclusion:—

"Whoso offereth me thanks and praise, he honoreth me; and to him who ordereth his conversation right will I show the salvation of God."



This psalm, so grand in its conception, so poetic in its composition, so elevated in its philosophy, not only in advance of the Jewish mind of old time, but adequate to the Christian mind of our day, is cut down one half by Mr. Clarke, left out altogether by Mr. Waterston, and reduced to three verses by Mr. Sears, which are used as an introduction to the next psalm, a penitential one of David, supposed to refer to the matter of Uriah.

One more specimen, and we have done. From the 19th Psalm, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork," Mr. Sears omits all the portion relating to the wonders of the heavens, and begins his extract with the seventh verse, "The law of the Lord is an undefiled law," &c. He omits the verse which contains the petition, "O, cleanse thou me from my secret faults," but gives the next, "Keep thy servant also from presumptuous sins," &c. Surely no sin can be more "presumptuous" than thus to play strip and waste with compositions, which for thirty centuries have been held divine by all believing minds, and whose inspiration even infidels admit.

These instances are, perhaps, enough to show how perilous it is to meddle with other men's compositions, in hopes of mending them, when it is altogether uncertain whether we have entered into the design of the author, or partake of his spirit. It strikes us as strange, that men of piety, taste, and intelligence should have allowed themselves to recompose, as it were, these sacred poems. To expunge is, perhaps, allowable, yet manifestly even this process requires care and caution; but to wed together, in the same "Selection," the accents of grief and joy, triumph and despair, youth and age, epochs separated by centuries, without any sign or intimation of change of subject, is a course of proceeding which, if applied to modern poetry, would excite only ridicule and disgust.

In most departments of their service-books, all these gentlemen have freely used the materials, and followed the model, of the Book of Common Prayer; but in one, they have all, excepting Mr. Sears, stopped short. We refer to the "Christian Year," the arrangement by which each season, as it returns, is made to remind us of the event in the history of our faith which took place at



that season. It is evidently not of great importance that strict accuracy should be attained in fixing these dates. So long as Christians agree in regarding the close of the year as the season of our Saviour's birth, the recurrence of that season is as fitly adapted to revive the memory of that event, as if the date were historically certain. The Christian year begins with Advent, a season of four Sundays, which precede the great festival of Christ's nativity, or Christmas. The next occasion which comes round is the commencement of his ministry, as marked by the manifestation at his baptism and at the marriage feast. His crucifixion is fitly preceded by a season of meditation and retirement, which, in analogy with his fasting and temptation in the wilderness, extends to forty days, and is called Lent. The resurrection is celebrated under the name of Easter, and the giving of the Holy Spirit under that of Whitsunday.

The method of observance indicated by the Prayer-book is by regular portions of Scripture, called Lessons, assigned to each occasion. That portion of the Gospels which records the event forms one of these Lessons, and some passage from the Old Testament, either prophetic of or in some way analogous to the event, forms the other. Anthems and psalms also, of an appropriate character, are set apart to be read or sung on those days; and very naturally the sermon will take its coloring from the associations of the day.

This arrangement infuses method and order into our religious services, whether conducted with the aids of public worship, or by ourselves at home. Without some such system, the reading of the Bible is in danger of becoming unconnected and fortuitous, and comparatively unprofitable. Where good judgment is used in the selection, it will be so to some extent, and where good judgment is wanting, how much worse!

Our readers are now pretty well aware what the King's Chapel Prayer-book is. It is the "Book of Common Prayer" of the Church of England and of the American Episcopal Church, modified and adapted to Congregational Unitarian worship. Its identity is not lost, we contend, by these modifications, nor the association weakened which connects our book with the forms used by the ancient Church, and by generations of wise



and good men in the Roman Catholic and English Churches ever since. We cannot expect that persons attached to those doctrines which are here omitted will approve of this book, but to those whose sentiments on those subjects agree with ours, we cordially recommend it.

A large number of the Unitarian societies of England use the reformed Liturgy. We have no expectation, nor scarcely a wish, that any of our existing churches should adopt it. The same causes that have hitherto prevented its adoption by any other society in this city will probably still prevent it. The people of New England are unused to that mode of public worship, and its unaccustomedness would create a distaste, which would probably prevent the experiment from being successful, if it did not prevent its being made. But in our sister cities, New York, for instance, the case is different. There the people are accustomed to the use of the prayer-book in public worship, and habit would be on the side of a Liturgy, instead of against it. In that city, we think, a church which should use this amended prayer-book would find a large number of ready hearers and friends. We know of several individuals, and we doubt not there are many, who, while they cling to the prayer-book of their early associations with a fondness that forbids their exchanging it for the totally different method of extemporaneous service, would gladly be relieved of many objectionable matters connected with the Church Prayer-book as it is. To such, we are sure, the adoption of this "Book of Common Prayer, according to the Use of King's Chapel, Boston," would seem, as it did to our fathers, "an auspicious turning from the dominion of creeds and phrases of man's device, to the easy yoke and authority of simple Scripture." \*

T. B.

---

\* Greenwood's History.



## ART. VIII.—ARCHITECTS AND ARCHITECTURE.\*

To erect a structure that shall combine "commodity, firmness, and delight," as Vitruvius hath it,—to make it serviceable, and at the same time expressive of its purpose,—is no easy task. Not impossible, we know, from the proofs that it has been done; not easy, we judge, from their rarity.

This scarcity of fine buildings among us has been attributed to various causes. The public say it is owing to the want of architects who are capable of producing them; the architects say that it is owing to the want of a cultivated public taste to appreciate a good building when it is built. Who shall decide? To our minds the answer is this. The public, it is true, are not capable of appreciating a fine building. But how should they be, when they have never seen any, or at least so few as not to give them an opportunity of forming their taste. Therefore it is plain that the initiative lies with the members of the architectural profession. Let them render themselves able to produce fine buildings, and a public taste will soon grow up to appreciate them.

The next inquiry which presents itself is,—Are the architects now thus competent? And the answer, we fear, must too generally be in the negative. Our architects, with a few honorable exceptions, may be divided into two classes. The one class consists of men, originally carpenters or masons, who have risen above their fellows, and who, sharing in the love of distinction common to humanity, prefer the name of architect to that of builder, which properly belongs to them. Should they confine themselves to executing the designs of others, they would succeed very well; for the practical part of construction they generally understand. But of that which distinguishes architecture from building, and gives it a claim to rank as one of the fine arts, they have but a dim and uncertain idea.

The second class of architects consists of those enter-

---

\* 1. *Hints on Public Architecture.* By ROBERT DALE OWEN. Published by order of the Smithsonian Institute.

2. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture.* By JOHN RUSKIN. New York: G. P. Putnam.



prising young men, who, with a happy audacity, consider themselves competent to perform any thing they may undertake, without the disagreeable formality of previous study. This class we know is a large one, and there is nothing wonderful in some of its members finding their way into this profession as well as others, except that it is more profitable to make quack pills than quack designs. The public, wisely enough, of two evils choose the least, and employ the "practical" architect, who knows little, in preference to the "theoretical" one, who knows nothing. While American architects consist for the most part of these sorts of men, is it wonderful that American architecture should be in such a languishing state?

In England, and on the Continent, architecture occupies its rightful position, as the chief and most important of the arts of design. The architect is prepared for the exercise of his profession by a long course of study, tested by strict examinations in mathematics, the physical sciences, and those generally relating to construction. The talents and energies of the student are called forth by the spirit of emulation produced by contests for medals and academic honors. Governments themselves contribute to the encouragement of successful merit, by bestowing thereon their patronage and protection, by conferring civil orders and decorations, and by endowing academies and professorships, which enable the man of science to devote his leisure to the cultivation and advancement of his art.

Such a thorough education as this we know little of in this country. Nor do we conceive it necessary that our architects should go through a precisely similar course. Something less theoretical would be more in accordance with our American ways. What Rousseau says of love applies equally well to this: — "*Il faut commencer par pratiquer ce qu'on veut apprendre.*" No matter how the thing is accomplished, provided the result is the same. The only class among us who pretend to this thorough education are our civil engineers, and to this cause alone is it owing that the finest specimens of architecture among us have been built by civil engineers. And so it will be until the architect shall educate himself properly, — until he shall aspire to know all that the civil



engineer deems necessary, and also that which makes architecture a fine art, that which relates to the proportions and decorations of his buildings. Even then he will not be a great architect, unless he has been gifted by God with the eye and feeling of an artist.

And now a few words on the mutual relations between architects and their employers, the public. Let us suppose that an architect, not one of the quack sort, but a really competent man, receives an order from somebody to design a building. From his experience of what any building ought to be to fulfil certain requisites, he makes his plans, which we will suppose satisfy his employer. He next proceeds to design the exterior of his edifice. He first rudely blocks out his masses, and gives to the different parts of his intended building their just and proper proportions, without which it is vain to expect beauty. He comes next to the ornamental parts. He carefully studies his mouldings and other decorative appendages, giving them all a similarity of chronology and style, and not mixing up the architecture of different ages and nations. He is also obliged to vary them in size, shape, and projection, according to the different places they will occupy on the building,—far from or near to the eye; in a strong south light or in shadow, and so forth. Having thus carefully prepared his design, in which all the parts bear that harmonic relation to each other and to the whole which makes a work of art, he submits it to his employer.

Now there is no propensity more deeply seated in the nature of man, and consequently none more difficult to restrain or more pleasant to exercise, than the judging or critical faculty. Nothing flatters our self-love more than to be able to offer our advice in regard to the work of another,—to suggest some improvement, or condemn some fault. For this, we all know, is very easy to do, and it at once raises us to an equality with, or elevates us above, the original producer or artist. It is unreasonable to suppose that the patrons of architects should be exempted from the operation of this general law, and therefore the employer of our friend probably replies, after having examined his design:—“This is quite beautiful. The Italian style, I perceive.—Ah, how classic! But then you must alter these square windows, and



put in Gothic arched ones. I always said, if ever I built a house, I would have sharp-pointed windows."

Conceive the horror of our friend, the architect, at this barbarous order. If he can, he convinces his employer of the impropriety of his wishes; if he is not able to do that, he must either resign his job, or perpetrate an architectural solecism, which shall cause him to groan in anguish every time he sees it. Now this is not an exaggerated case. Similar ones are occurring every day, and they will occur, until our architects shall have become so well educated that the public shall put perfect confidence in their judgment, and no more dare to interfere with the creations of their genius, than to suggest an alteration in one of Shakspeare's plays, or propose some additional verses to Marco Bozzaris.

That this time will come is not a chimerical supposition, for it has come to civil engineers. They are much less interfered with than architects, and the less troubled as they have the greater reputation. No one had the assurance to propose to Mr. John B. Jervis to alter the proportions of his Croton viaduct at Haerlem; nor would they to an architect who was as well acquainted with his business as is that distinguished engineer with his.

Having thus said a few words in regard to what we think our architects ought to be, we will now give our views in regard to what our architecture ought to be.

The first requisite which a building should possess, which the translator of Vitruvius calls commodity, is, that it should entirely answer the purpose for which it is built. This seems simple enough, but how few, alas! of our buildings can escape censure on this important point. It should neither be too large nor too small, too mean nor too expensive; and least of all should any requisite of utility be sacrificed to appearance, as we see every day in our imitation of Greek architecture, where we submit to the darkening of our windows to gain the effect of a colonnade.

To be able to erect a building which shall possess this quality of commodity requires in the architect experience derived from much observation and thought, and a good stock of judgment and common sense.

The next requisite, that of firmness, demands excellence in the construction. It should not only be perfectly substantial, but this firmness should be gained with the



least possible outlay of labor and material, and consequently of expense, although it is better to err in making a building too strong than too weak.

To perform this well requires that the architect should be both theoretically and practically acquainted with carpentry, masonry, and the properties and uses of iron. So far we have required of him what we expect in a good builder or engineer. Now we go farther.

The third requisite, that of delight, or those things which make a building a work of art, is more difficult to define, as well as attain; but we may say that it depends upon three things.

The first is proportion, without which the eye can never be satisfied. The second is truthful expression, or that the building should show on its face the purpose for which it is designed. Lastly, finish, or the correspondence which the material of which the building is composed, the style of architecture employed, and the ornamental details, should have with one another and as a whole.

And in expression is comprised what Mr. Ruskin so strongly insists on in his *Lamp of Truth*,—that there should be no deception about the building; that every part should show for just what it is, and not pretend to be any thing else. A good architect will make a chimney, commonly an unsightly object, of such a beautiful shape as to be an ornament instead of a blemish. A bad one would try to make us believe that it was not a chimney, but a campanile, or bell-turret.

Having thus pointed out the threefold standard to which we deem it necessary that a building should conform, in order to rank as a fine piece of architecture, we have thought it instructive, and we hope it will not prove tedious, to examine some of our lately erected public buildings, and see how far they actually do conform to it.

First in point of magnitude is the new reservoir on Beacon Hill. In regard to commodity we have heard no fault found. Firmness it certainly has; and these two excellences are nothing but what we should expect from the distinguished engineers who had charge of its construction. And in the third quality which makes a fine piece of architecture, as well as engineering, we are glad to say we believe it as little deficient. It is expressive of its purpose; in those long rows of arches and massive



piers, in those solid and enduring walls, we recognize the truthful expression of its fitness to answer that purpose. It is good, and it shows itself to be so.

In regard to the finish, we cannot express too highly our gratification; for we here see that noble building material, Quincy granite, applied as it properly should be, — expressing strength and power. Our architects have generally spoiled their granite, whose attribute is strength, by smoothing and polishing its surface, and trying to make it like marble, thereby weakening its effect at a great cost. In this structure, the roughness of the material is its merit. The style of architecture was judiciously chosen. The Roman style is more expressive of strength and endurance than any other, and hence is very appropriate to such a work. The only purely ornamental detail is the cornice, or corbel-table, which crowns the whole, which we think is very effective. Its fault is one which seems to be inseparable from the nature of the ground. On the lower side of the reservoir, which is some sixty feet high, the cornice has the proper proportion, that makes it too heavy on the upper side, which is about a third as high as the lower. It is difficult, however, to see how this could have been avoided.

Here, then, is one structure, which, tried by the standard we have made, we can call a fine piece of architecture.

Among the buildings recently erected in Boston, there is none more conspicuous than the new Athenæum in Beacon Street. This building, so far as we can learn, answers every requisition which convenience and utility demand. It rather errs on the side of too much firmness than too little. The proportions are good, but the expression of the building is its chief merit. The effect is that of rich and elaborate elegance, which seems to stamp it at once as a building dedicated to literature and the fine arts. The style is of that species of Italian palatial architecture which was developed by Palladio. The rich, warm color of the material is very pleasing to the eye. The defect in the design, as it seems to us, is a certain tameness and absence of power, which arises from the different projections not being bold enough, and from a general want of simplicity. The façade is too much broken up, and covered with ornament, allowing no place for the eye to rest. A little more of what John Ruskin calls "the Rembrandtism of architecture" would improve



the building wonderfully. This absence of power is a less defect, inasmuch as beauty and elegance are to be expressed here rather than power; but still it is a defect, which no one sees more clearly than the accomplished architect himself.

Another building which excites much deserved admiration is the Boston Museum in Tremont Street. This is in the Roman palatial style; a style, we venture to assert, better adapted to the wants of our city architecture than any other. The firmness which this building shows puts to shame many others, where huge granite fronts are supported on puny cast-iron columns, which, if really strong enough to be safe (which we doubt), do not look so, and therefore ought not to be used. Sydney Smith prophesied that the dangerous practice of locking passengers into railway trains would never be discontinued until a bishop was burned alive in consequence. Perhaps this dangerous custom of building upon nothing will not be prohibited until a mayor falls a martyr.

The granite of which the Museum is built, though not so rough as that of the reservoir, is left sufficiently unhewn to bring out by contrast the effect of the dressed mouldings and cornice. The proportions of the interior hall are not so satisfactory as those of the façade. It is too narrow for its length and height, and the columns look too heavy. The flight of stairs, at the end of the hall, leading to the theatre, shows what a beautiful effect may be produced by this piece of interior architecture.

Another large building in the Roman palatial style is the terminal station of the Old Colony Railroad Company. The use of material here is good. The brick and dressed freestone mouldings harmonize well together, and the former brings out the latter in fine relief. The merit of this building, we think, lies in its adaptation to its purpose. The main edifice is of the size that utility demands, — sufficient to contain as many rooms as were wanted, and no more. Connected with this are the car sheds, which make necessarily a long, low building. The eye rests on the main structure, and we judge of the architecture of that, and consider the shed, as it is, merely an appendage. Had the Fitchburg station been built in this way, instead of carrying up the whole building, four hundred feet long, to the height of two stories, thereby giving room which is not needed, much of its cost would



have been saved. And yet the Old Colony station is as fine a piece of architecture certainly as the other, where a great expense was incurred merely "for looks."

The Roman palatial style we are glad to see becoming common in our cities. It is a rational, sensible style of architecture. It has no useless ornament. Its effect is derived from proportion, and from decorating and showing boldly the construction. The broad cornice intercepts the sun in summer, but not in winter, and protects the walls from the weather, besides giving a character to the whole building. The arched windows and doors express strength, as does the rustic base, when used, at the quoins at the angles. No useless pilasters support nothing; no worse than useless columns shut out the free light and air. There is no other style where so much effect is produced with so little money, a consideration which should recommend it to our thrifty people.

The Church of the Saviour, in Bedford Street, is a beautiful reproduction of mediæval art. Our buildings, generally, of the pointed style, show undeniable evidence of their origin. A window of the thirteenth century stands cheek by jowl with a door of the fifteenth, because they happened to be both in the same volume of Mr. Pugin's or Mr. Britton's book, from which the architect (?) copied them. What Mr. Robert Dale Owen calls the paleontology of architecture is utterly ignored; and a hybrid style, a confused mass of pinnacles and pointed arches, is the only result. There is no vitality about it. It is as dead as Erwin de Steinbach himself.

But the architect of this church has shown himself a master. In his hands the style is as plastic as it was four hundred years ago. There is harmony and symmetry about the whole building,—a prevalence of leading lines all flowing gracefully upward, symbolizing the aspiration of the soul to heaven, which the Christian or pointed style labors to express. The details are as beautiful as the general form, and as a piece of architecture we must call it a gem, and, if it were intended for the Catholic worship, a faultless one. But here is the defect of this otherwise "entire and perfect chrysolite." The buildings of the mediæval architects were intended, not for Protestants, but for Catholics.

The "long-drawn aisles" and interminable vistas.



were intended to give vast processions of worshippers opportunity of seeing the elevation of the host, and the splendid ceremonies of the mass. The "fretted vaults" resounded with the music of the majestic organ, and the mingled anthems of a thousand voices. The "gairish light of day" was excluded by the rich stained glass of the windows, and replaced by a dim, religious twilight, which aided the solemn effect of the scene. Every thing was calculated to stimulate emotion and repress thought. But when we attempt to reproduce such a building for the Congregational form of worship, the effect is always inconvenient, often ridiculous. The preacher can hardly be seen at the end of one of the long aisles, and had he the voice of Stentor, he could hardly hope to penetrate the forest of columns and projections which intercept sight and sound. The stained glass of the windows usually makes it so dark, that it is with much ado that we can see to read our hymn-books; and if the sun is very bright, it colors the congregation red, blue, and yellow, like a company of disabled prize-fighters, astonishing the beholders with green spots on the roseate bonnets of the ladies, and purple patches on the "frosty pows" of the elders.

Perhaps a time will come, as some predict, when our form of worship will be modified, and we shall have less of "this immoderate desire for preaching," which is so strong now. Until then, however, we had better beware of cathedrals. Mr. Upjohn was much derided for refusing to build a cathedral for a Unitarian society; his motives may have been worthy of derision, but in the main we think he was right. The Congregational form of worship is eminently social, and the buildings, to be in character, should be light, airy, and cheerful. Instead of imitating minsters, and attempting to breathe life into the dry bones of a bygone age, our architects should strive to make their buildings subservient to the uses and wants of to-day, — to let them boldly express their purpose on their fronts; and whatever of ornament the artist can add, let it be in keeping. If our architects will dare to do this, perhaps they may be able to produce a new style, which shall be modern and American.

T. C. C.



## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*On the Causes of the Success of the English Revolution of 1640 – 1688. A Discourse. Designed as an Introduction to the History of the Reign of Charles the First.* By M. GUIZOT. London: John Murray. 1850. 8vo. pp. 138.

THE object which M. Guizot proposes to himself in this very able tractate is worthy of his distinguished abilities as a statesman and historian. It is, "to show what are the causes which have crowned constitutional monarchy in England, and republican government in the United States, with that solid and lasting success which France and the rest of Europe are still vainly pursuing." And certainly there has never been a time when it was more important that that problem should be rightly solved, or when practical statesmen could study the lessons of the past to greater advantage, than now. Amidst the thousand conflicting theories of the present, it is well to go back to the history of other ages, and calmly survey the causes which produced, the principles which controlled, and the results which flowed from, their revolutions. This M. Guizot has attempted to do; and though we are reluctantly compelled to dissent from some of the judgments which he pronounces, we cannot but regard his essay as a valuable contribution to the philosophy of history.

After a few judicious remarks on the elementary characteristics of the Protestant Reformation, and on the impulse given to the popular mind throughout Europe by that great outbreak against despotic power, M. Guizot proceeds at once to speak of the different causes which united in bringing about the English Revolution, and impressed upon it its peculiar character. He next traces somewhat in detail the principal events which marked its history down to the final settlement of the government by the Convention Parliament of 1688. Then, after glancing at the various ineffectual attempts of the Stuarts to regain their ancestral throne, and summing up his own view of the whole period, he devotes a few pages to our American Revolution, concluding with a comparative estimate of Cromwell, William the Third, and Washington, in the main well considered and eloquently expressed. From this survey of his subject he draws one important lesson, as the result of his investigations, in which lies the *gist* of the whole discussion, — that "the policy which preserves a state from violent revolutions is also the only policy which can bring a revolution to a successful close." Few persons will be bold enough to question the truth of this postulate, though it may



well admit of doubt whether it is sufficiently broad to cover all the ground opened by M. Guizot's inquiry.

It should seem that much of the success attending the English and American Revolutions arose from the circumstance, that in both instances the people were prepared by a previous discipline for the enjoyment of a larger measure of freedom than they had before possessed. The revolutionary struggles on the Continent of Europe, in South America, and in Mexico, have failed of that large and permanent success which awaited similar struggles in England and the United States, because the people had not become fitted for self-government. A full-grown man can be intrusted with a much greater liberty of self-command than a child. In other words, the previous character of a people will, in a great degree, determine whether failure or success shall follow their attempts to reform the abuses of their political system. And since no plan of government can be so generalized as to apply to every nation, it appears far more important that revolutionists should correctly understand the character of their own people, than that they should aim to free their resistance to arbitrary power from every thing like violence. Where the abuses are many and great, more violence must be used in removing those abuses than is needful where the abuses are few and insignificant. Yet the same success will attend either revolution, if the people are equally capable of tasting the blessings of a purer government. In England, the Revolution of 1688 and the Reform Bill of 1832 both effected the purposes which they were designed to accomplish; but neither of them would have been suited to the state of affairs which called for the other.

This is substantially the view so admirably set forth by Mr. Macaulay in his *History of England*. At the time of the English Revolution, as he very happily remarks, the monarchy and Parliament both existed as they had been constituted during the Middle Ages; and as standing armies had not yet come into fashion, the power of the sovereign was checked by his dependence upon that body for the military service which formed a striking feature in the feudal system, and which alone enabled him to maintain the royal power and dignity. Accordingly, when he sought to free himself from this dependence, the popular resistance assumed the character of a preserving, rather than a destroying, revolution, and was marked by a devotion to ancient forms and precedents. Pym, in 1640, and Somers, in 1688, alike appealed to them. On the other hand, the Continental revolutions did not take place until all traces of the limited monarchy of the Middle Ages had vanished, and parliaments had fallen into desuetude. A different set of institutions had taken their place, standing armies had been organized, and power had become concentrated in the hands of the monarch. A destroying revolution was therefore needed to restore the popular free-



dom and the popular rights ; and the people having, in the mean time, lost their capability of self-government, their revolutions have been nothing better than so many trials of irrational and impracticable theories. Moreover, these revolutions have taken place in regions where infidelity and the idolatrous superstitions of the Romish Church have exerted their blighting and withering influence upon the intellectual energies of the people. The English Revolution itself wellnigh made shipwreck on the High Church doctrine of passive obedience and the divine right of kings ; and we should just as soon expect a popular revolution to succeed in New Holland or New Zealand as in France, Spain, Italy, or Germany, so long as skepticism or Romanism prevails there. Free institutions cannot flourish upon the soil which infidelity has made its own. They cannot live by the side of the Romish Church.

Our principal objection to M. Guizot's view is, that he does not seem to attach sufficient importance to these considerations. In general, however, he exhibits the same calmness, moderation, and impartiality which characterized his former work on the English Revolution. But the deplorable events of the year 1848 appear to have rendered him too distrustful of all revolutions, and to have led him to form too unfavorable an opinion of the Long Parliament, and particularly of those members of it who entertained republican principles. Yet it should constantly be borne in mind that the very men — Hyde, Falkland, and Colepepper — who, in the commencement of the struggle, supported the most violent, unconstitutional, and revolutionary measures, were afterwards among the most zealous supporters of Charles the First. Strafford's plan of *Thorough* was more unconstitutional than any measure proposed by the popular party previous to the death of Pym, with, perhaps, the single exception of the vote that Parliament should not be dissolved without its own consent. The execution of Charles, too, must be regarded rather as a great and fatal blunder than as a crime. With these and a very few similar objections, we have said all that a rigorous criticism can urge against M. Guizot's essay. For breadth of grasp, clearness of statement, and general soundness of view, it will compare favorably with any similar work on the subject which has fallen under our notice ; and whatever differences of opinion may arise in regard to particular points, all will agree that it is a work of singular ability.

---

*In Memoriam.* Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1850.  
16mo. pp. 216.

THE author's name does not appear in connection with this



elegant tribute of enduring friendship, and we have only the initials of the cherished companion to whose memory it is dedicated. But it is well understood that we are indebted for it to one of the most deservedly popular poets of the day, and that it commemorates the death of a son of the historian Hallam. No one, indeed, who is acquainted with Mr. Tennyson's works, could fail to recognize his tender sensibility, his teeming fancy, and the exquisite melody of his verse, in every part of the volume. Under its quaint title he has comprised a series of elegiac poems marked by all the higher qualities of his genius, which will not only be received with pleasure by the lovers of his poetry everywhere, but which will carry consolation to many a mourner, and take a permanent place in the literature of the affections. In them we trace the natural flow of the poet's grief, from the hour when he first hears of his friend's death in a foreign land, along through years of sadness and sorrow, until with a sober and chastened joy he invokes a blessing on his sister's marriage with another, only less noble and less loved than the buried friend who seems to him a silent guest, even at the wedding feast. We see his faith struggling with his sense of loss, gradually subduing his doubts, and at length coming off victorious from the protracted conflict. "In Memoriam," in short, is a perfect transcript of the poet's spiritual life under a bereavement which colors all his thoughts and meditations, and which is present to his mind in all the events of many successive years.

We have little disposition to criticize a volume which speaks so directly from the individual consciousness of the writer to the best feelings and purest sentiments of his readers; and, in truth, the very nature of its subject at once takes it out of the ordinary province of criticism. It is a book to be read in entire sympathy with its author, and not a volume to be subjected to the stern judgment of those who practise the "ungenial craft." The hard, cold world has nothing to do with such sacred outpourings of sorrow as we here find. They belong to the inner experience of the mourner, — an experience almost too holy for any but one's bosom friends to witness.

---

*Introductory Lessons on Christian Evidences.* By ARCHBISHOP WHATELY. Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols. 16mo. pp. 130.

ONE of the most encouraging signs of the times is an increasing and healthy interest in the religious education of the young, with the consequent multiplication of proper religious manuals. The children of our connection have long suffered from the well-



founded jealousy of doctrinal catechisms, which has gained so strong a hold upon parents and teachers ; but we begin at length to realize that instructions may be positive and definite without being sectarian, and that a liberal and judicious training in youth is the best protection against sectarianism. The religious partisan finds no victim so ready as the young man or woman, whose natural teachers have unwisely abstained from "influencing" him, and have left the ground unplanted, because there might be some mistake about the seed. Through one or another method, as circumstances shall determine, the children of our churches must be brought under a systematic Christian culture ; it is no small part of the work intrusted to the Christian pastor to see that the truth of the Gospel is brought to bear upon the mind and heart of childhood. There is reason to believe that this whole subject of early religious training is to be reinvestigated, and that, ere many years shall have elapsed, we shall have no cause to lament the temporary evils that have proceeded from the disuse of the old catechisms. In this matter the careful and discriminating labors of many minds are needed. Guarded as we are by our history and position against creeds and formularies, there would seem to be little danger in united effort for the preparation of religious manuals for the young. Perhaps, however, our favorite individualism will carry us safely through, and at least supply materials for selection and compilation.

The little book before us, attributed, as it would seem with sufficient reason, to that large-minded Christian scholar, Archbishop Whately, well deserves a place in a series of Sunday-school manuals. As suggested in the American Preface, it should come somewhat late in the course of study, according to the apostolic rule, "Add to your faith knowledge." The high culture which our religious and moral affections may receive under the Gospel is the best preparation for the study of Gospel evidences. It enables the mind to satisfy the condition, "They that are of the truth hear my voice." It does not prejudice us, but is a protection against prejudices, — the prejudices of animal and worldly passion.

Archbishop Whately has not discussed in this little book the genuineness of the Gospels. He has aimed rather to present some general considerations, suggested by a study of the contents of the Old and New Scriptures in connection with the history of the age in which Christianity appeared, the human advantages of the Evangelists, and the present prevalence of the Gospel. Besides this, we have remarks upon the evidence from prophecy, which, as is at once apparent, does not depend upon the genuineness of the *New Testament* ; and two eminently Christian and suggestive chapters upon Modern Jews, considered in their relation to Christianity. Those who are familiar with the writings



of Archbishop Whately will not need to be told that this book is marked by discerning and judicious thought, clothed in a style of rare simplicity and clearness. We cannot but think that some of our over-confident doubters might read the little treatise with much profit, and gain some light upon miracles, with their relation to the internal evidences, and the weight to be allowed to *objections* generally. For children who have begun to inquire and reason, this Introduction to the Christian Evidences will be found very useful.

---

*A Treatise on Plane and Spherical Trigonometry.* By WILLIAM CHAUVENET, A. M., Professor of Mathematics in the United States Naval Academy. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1850.

THIS is one of a class of books as yet rare in America, but of which there is, fortunately, good promise for the future. Professor Chauvenet has furnished a work excellently adapted for use as a collegiate text-book; but he, nevertheless, had a higher aim. The volume before us is the most complete treatise on Trigonometry with which we are acquainted in any language. The author has availed himself of the important labors of living mathematicians, and we here find valuable formulæ, which are not given in any other tolerably complete work on the subject known to us.

In the original parts, Professor Chauvenet has added to his previous reputation, and we observe that the *Astronomical Journal* has expressed a highly favorable opinion, in a special notice of the work.

---

*Confessions of an English Opium Eater, and Suspiria de Profundis.* By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1850. 16mo. pp. 272.

*Sighs from the Depths* those certainly are which are expressed in this volume. Whether they are also the sighs of true penitence and remorse is to be learned only by those who peruse the pages. For many years these Confessions, which were out of print in this country, held a place in literature where they stood alone, as in fact they still do, with the single exception of those letters of Coleridge which are made public in Cottle's Reminiscences. There is an intensely dramatic interest in this volume. It is the dissection of a living man,—of his muscles, nerves, brain, and heart, piece by piece, and then, not metaphorically either, an analysis of all the torturing sentiments of remorse and horror, of wicked elation and unholy aspiration, as the fruits of a tempting but sharply-fanged vice. The autobiography of anguish



is here delineated, not in a way to repel the reader from going to the end of the tale, but with a curious sympathy which fastens him to every page. The remarkable man who, thirty years ago, made public these confessions, has since produced some of the finest biographical and literary essays in our language, — essays which are animated by the author's peculiar genius. The publishers of the present volume promise to give us his other works in the same neat form.

---

*Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell.* Edited by WILLIAM BEATTIE, M. D., one of his Executors. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1850. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 556, 522.

WITH far more variety of narrative and incident, and with contributions from a wider circle of literary acquaintances than we had expected, these two large volumes will make a delightful addition to our literary stores. Personal particulars, if not so homely as to be undignified, or so minute as to be tedious, or so ungracious as to be scandalous, are, after all, the matter of a book which will most interest the mass of readers. Dr. Beattie has given us abundance of such material in his biographical sketches, in his genealogy and family history of the poet, and in the running commentary upon every incident in his life, and almost every line of his verse. Besides all the home incidents, we have also the field of foreign travel, as illustrated by Campbell's pen, to afford us continual variety. The names of a large number of the distinguished literary coteries of which only two or three individuals still survive are constantly brought before us in these pages, with not a little of their correspondence. A genial letter from Washington Irving to the Messrs. Harper is a warrant for the success of their enterprise in this republication. From the superficial examination which is all that we have had time as yet to make of these volumes, we look for much enjoyment from their deliberate perusal.

---

*A Narrative of Voyages and Commercial Enterprises.* By RICHARD J. CLEVELAND. Third Edition, with Illustrations by Billings. Boston: Charles H. Peirce. 1850. 12mo. pp. 408.

MR. CLEVELAND's modest but graphic narrative has already been received with great favor by those whose personal acquaintance with him gave added interest to his written experience, as well as by a much larger circle of readers. His voyages were made before steam had effected such a revolution in commercial enterprises, and before our merchant-ships were of the size and



equipment of the present day. For more than twenty years he tracked the deep in all the open waters of the globe. He saw some countries at a period when they had a fresher interest than now. We feel that we may receive with perfect confidence all that he writes. We commend the volume to all who will value a work of authority on subjects which are often treated with romance rather than with fact.

---

*A Survey of the Doctrines and Duties of Religion.* By ABEL B. JACOBS, Author of a Work on "The Moral Government of God." Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1850. 16mo. pp. 80.

THIS little work is too brief and incomplete to serve as any more than a manual of instruction, of which the lessons shall be helped out and illustrated by the teacher. Perhaps it is on that account all the better adapted to convey, by a very simple method, an idea of those great truths which any number of volumes would not exhaust. Discretion and clearness, with succinctness of speech, and very sensible observations, characterize the volume.

---

*Christian Thought on Life. In a Series of Discourses.* By HENRY GILES, Author of "Lectures and Essays." Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1850. 16mo. pp. 287.

THERE are thirteen of these Discourses, which, with suitable adaptation to their theme, may be said to thrill with life, with an electric, nervous energy, that quickens their style, and bears us on through them without any flagging of the attention. We have before given the subjects of them, and should we have an opportunity to offer at no distant season some suggestions upon the present attitude of the pulpit and the work of preaching, we shall have occasion again to use this volume.

---

*The Rebels; or Boston before the Revolution.* By the Author of "Hobomok." Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1850. 12mo. pp. 288.

THIS story, which was one of the earliest productions of the easy pen of Mrs. L. M. Child, was a favorite with us many long years ago. We have read since several of her writings, but in none of them have we found more vigor, more grace of conception, as shown in portraying characters, and inventing conversation, or more fidelity to fact. The story can hardly be called a



novel, as so much of its contents is actual history. The authoress had indeed the most tempting material. The town of Boston, just before the breaking out of hostilities in the War for Independence presented in miniature all the elements and parties of the strife that could have been found over the whole country. Many family connections, and more than one affair of the heart, met with the rudest trials before the first blow was struck, and thus the main pivot for a work of fiction might be had without the trouble of invention. The British officers in the town were enemies, not of its female residents, but rather of the old men and the young men. Mrs. Child might try her skill again, and we warrant her a goodly number of readers.

---

*Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange.* By JOHN FRANCIS. Author of the "History of the Bank of England, its Times and Traditions." Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1850. 8vo. pp. 167.

THERE are but few persons of any large knowledge of life, in these commercial times, who are wholly ignorant of the mystery that goes by the name of stock-jobbing, or by a less offensive name, as brokerage. But there cannot be many who will read the revelations made in this volume without amazement at being made acquainted for the first time with the arts and devices, the bold schemes, and the intricate calculations, which enter into the traffic in money. This volume, whose title might deter many persons from perusing it, on the supposition that it deals with mere mercantile matters, is in parts as exciting in its interest as the most highly wrought romances. The origin and influence of a national debt, the mania for speculations, the great bubbles which have agitated the avaricious passions, and sketches of famous money brokers, form the principal contents of the volume.

---

*The School Hymn-Book, for Normal, High, and Grammar Schools.* Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1850. 18mo. pp. 240.

THIS little volume is designed to meet a want, which has been felt more and more, as the custom of opening or closing the daily exercises by singing has been introduced into an increasing number of our schools. That custom we most heartily approve. It is a real improvement in our times, concerning which we think it hardly possible that there can be two opinions. We should find a most decisive reason for preferring one school to another for our own children in the fact that in one of them the



art of singing was taught and practised daily. As a statute of this Commonwealth forbids the introduction into its public schools "of any book favoring the tenets of any sect of Christians," all hymns that would come under this ban are excluded from the little volume before us. It contains 328 hymns, with a list of tunes, and an index of subjects, and is commended to public approbation by the Principals of our three Normal Schools.

---

\* \* \* The Rev. Professor Park's Discourse before the Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts is published in a separate form (Boston, Perkins & Whipple, 8vo, pp. 44), as well as in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July. It bears the title, "The Theology of the Intellect and of the Feelings." So far as we can express briefly the ground or basis of the distinction here raised, the preacher would refer the statement of religious truths, when made in strong, unqualified, or highly figurative language, unguarded and exaggerated, to the sentiments and emotions, thus constituting the theology of the feelings; but when the truths thus stated are qualified and harmonized by mediating between the strong and various expression of them, then the intellect has a theology. Unless, as we cannot but surmise is the case, something more is implied in this distinction and in the illustration of it beyond what Professor Park actually asserts, we see little, if any thing, in it beside the well-known variance between truth as stated in disjointed sentences and hyperboles, and truth as drawn out in carefully worded phrases. But we think we discern intimations of a more significant idea than this below the rich rhetoric and the wonderfully brilliant sentences of this discourse. Utterly apart from the idea which it aims to illustrate, it will chain attention, and reward perusal, by its elegant diction, its elaborate style, and its finely exhaustive use of the most expressive of the Scripture similes. There is a passage on page 33, which our readers may hunt out if they please, but which seems to us to come properly under neither the theology of the intellect nor the theology of the feelings. We should really be glad to know whether it formed a part of the original conception of the discourse, or was suggested by circumstances.

The Oration delivered before the city authorities of Boston, on July 4, 1850, by Edwin R. Whipple, (J. H. Eastburn, 8vo, pp. 30,) is entitled, "Washington and the Principles of the Revolution." It is of a wholly different style and manner from those numerous performances delivered on the anniversary of the Declaration of American Independence which have made such orations synonymous with bombast, fustian, and diseased patriotism. For acuteness of analysis, for vigor of thought, and even



for novelty of idea and method, this oration is remarkable. Something in its phraseology, or in its moulding into sentences and periods, makes it rather difficult to read it aloud, and it is a perfect marvel to us how the author could commit it and deliver it *memoriter*. After developing the idea of liberty or freedom which lay at the basis of the struggle, and presenting our Revolution as a contest for "rights which were customs, for ideas which were facts, for liberties which were actually existing laws," Mr. Whipple sketches, with a fine but strong pen, the British ministry of the day, and then comes to his noble theme, Washington. The orator seizes upon that wellnigh universal portraiture of Washington, which has long presented him as a singularly upright man of moderate mental abilities, and before he has done he has satisfied us that our great chief was intellectually a genius, a man of a great mind, of a noble soul, of the largest gifts of nature, and the loftiest acquisitions of character. Mr. Whipple says of him, — "This illustrious man, at once the world's admiration and enigma, we are taught by a fine instinct to venerate, and by a wrong opinion to misjudge." Never did antithesis state a more decisive truth. Washington has been underrated by all who have, in any way, qualified his greatness.

"An Essay on the Opium Trade, including a Sketch of its History, Extent, Effects, etc., as carried on in India and China, by Nathan Allen, M. D.," (Boston, John P. Jewett & Co., Svo, pp. 68,) is the title of a pamphlet from which we have gathered much valuable information, while we have perused it with most painful feelings. Without aiming after an effect, the author produces one of the most impressive character. He records, with proper authentications, the history of the growth of opium, the honest and smuggling trade in it, the art and management which are used to put it into the hands of its consumers, the vast amount of expense which attends its use, the opposition which its sale has met with, the attempts of the Chinese government to exclude it, and the abominable course of the English government in forcing its sale and enriching itself by the traffic. Then, by the most startling descriptions, the horrible effects of opium-smoking and opium-eating are drawn out before us. We commend this very valuable essay to all who would have any thing like an accurate idea of the startling facts, which have not previously been made public in so complete a form. We feel indebted to Dr. Allen for the service which he will have rendered to humanity in thus exposing an iniquity through which half a million of human beings in China annually find a premature grave, and that people are drained annually of fifty millions of dollars as the price of their own ruin.



A Memoir of John Bromfield, by Josiah Quincy, (Cambridge, Metcalf & Co., 8vo, pp. 34,) does something towards removing a general impression in this community, — an impression shared in a measure, too, by some of the friends of the late Mr. Bromfield, — that he was a man of a morose and miserly nature. Known, as he was, as a man without family, living in the most economical manner, and seen upon the exchange, where the vicissitudes of the money-market offer opportunities to the rich financier, he was supposed by many to be sordidly penurious, and no great lover of his kind. Mr. Quincy gives a brief sketch of his life and character, principally in very interesting letters from a few of the intimate acquaintances of the deceased, and presents him to us, not in an exalted, but in a dignified manner, as struggling on from an adverse youth and early manhood, till, by industry and probity and prudence, which taught him economy and thrift, and in spite of some marked peculiarities, he achieved independence. He is found to have been faithful, in his own way, to the duties of humanity while he lived, besides endowing the Boston Athenæum with \$25,000 in his lifetime, and leaving public legacies to the amount of \$110,000.

The Oration delivered by Edward Everett, on the Celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, has been published, together with an account of the celebration in the great ship-house, and at the dinner-table (Boston, Redding & Co., 8vo, pp. 80). The occasion was a marked one. The orator thus completes his work of associating his splendid periods and his eloquent voice with the three great battle-scenes of Massachusetts. His orations at Concord and Lexington are more descriptive, but this is the most philosophical, and its paragraphs are burdened with the wisdom of a rich experience, pervaded by thought and study.

Two more of the "Latter-Day Pamphlets, edited by Thomas Carlyle," No. VII., Hudson's Statue, and No. VIII., Jesuitism, (16mo, pp. 48, 58,) have been published by Phillips, Sampson, & Co., Boston.

Mr. Elizur Wright of this city has taken Mr. Carlyle in hand, and after much the same fashion in the use or abuse of the English language, and by the aid of incongruous epithets and images, seeks to riddle the Latter-Day Pamphlets. We suppose that Mr. Wright intends to do his work upon each one of Mr. Carlyle's series. "Perforations in the Latter-Day Pamphlets" is the title under which Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. have issued the first number of Mr. Wright's essays, in uniform appearance with their reprints of Carlyle. (pp. 48.)



Messrs. Phillips, Sampson, & Co. have published the twenty-third semi-monthly number of their rich and valuable edition of Shakspeare. Without any falling off in the mechanical excellence of the paper, the type, or the engravings, each successive number sustains the reputation of the work, and finds, we believe, an increasing circulation. We again commend it to all who are without a proper copy of the great poet.

Lester's "Gallery of Illustrious Americans," an enterprise of great merit, presents for its seventh and eighth numbers, fine engravings of Colonel Fremont and of William H. Prescott, with accompanying biographical sketches. The more the editor is patronized, the better will he labor to make his enterprise most successful.

The Messrs. Harper have published, in a neat form, an American edition of Sydney Smith's *Moral Philosophy*, a work which is noticed in our pages.

Messrs. Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln have published a second and revised edition of Professor Felton's translation of Professor Guyot's *Lectures on "The Earth and Man."* This valuable work, whose merits we have already discussed, has appeared in two editions in London, and in one at Paris.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields have published a new volume of poems by Whittier, entitled "*Songs of Labor.*" We have not had time to examine it, but the author, as a poet or prose-writer, needs no introduction to our readers.

The history of the American Revolution is put into a most attractive form for the young, and indeed for their parents, in the serial work by Lossing, entitled "*The Pictorial Field-Book of the American Revolution,*" five numbers of which, beautifully printed and richly illustrated, have been published by the Harpers.

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

---

### LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

*Death of Neander.* — A recent arrival from Europe has brought to us the intelligence of the decease of one of the most honored and worthy of the great Christian scholars of Germany, Dr. Augustus Neander.



der. He died of a form of cholera, on Sunday, July 14, at Berlin, where, for a period longer than that of a human generation, he has been an instructor of successive bands of Christian teachers, and has helped to train religiously the mind of his whole nation. He was, in many respects, a remarkable and a very interesting man. He was born of Jewish parentage, in the year 1787, at Göttingen. At the early age of seventeen he was converted to Christianity. Of course, at that stage of his intellectual and spiritual development his conversion can scarcely be claimed as involving the highest exercise of judgment, and must have been, more or less, influenced by circumstances independent of his own mental action. But his whole subsequent career continually kept open before him the grounds and reasons on which he retained a residuum of his former faith in Judaism, and the whole of his after faith in the Gospel, as the blossom and the fruit of a revelation from God. Over and over again, with all the thoroughness and erudition of the highest class of German scholars, with a most penetrating sagacity, and a most patient candor, did he study the whole written lore of the ancient world, and especially the records of Christian antiquity. The collisions of an incessant scholastic warfare, the acute and ingenious, though often fanciful and shadowy, theories of a race of Biblical critics, and the destructive systems of unbelief and so-called philosophy which continually arose around him, forbade his mind to rust, or his faith to continue alive without daily renewal. Neander lived and wrote and taught through one of the most critical periods of the discussions which involve the authority and the substance of the revelation made by God through Jesus Christ. No weapon which sophistry, logic, ridicule, or real scholarship and the most exhausting skill of sharp intellects, could find to employ against the Gospel, was left untried by some of those who lived contemporaneously with him, and even taught directly at his side. If with some degree of satisfaction we may claim his adherence to an old-fashioned Christian belief as a proof of the undamaged foundations of the Gospel, we may with even higher satisfaction call to mind his acknowledged candor, his perfect freedom from all rancor, his generous confidence, his fearless tolerance in dealing with those who labored to destroy what he sought to build up. A poor bigot, or even a timid and sincere believer, would probably have used the power, which Neander had offered to him, of forbidding the publication in Prussia of Strauss's "Life of Jesus." But Neander discouraged such weak opposition to the entire liberty of the mind and the press, and advised that the work should be allowed to circulate with perfect freedom, while it should be subjected to the fair trial of a perusal, an examination, and a reply. He was faithful in the exercise of his abilities to these latter ends, and so could well dispense with the help of his fears.

Of all the works of Neander, his *History of the Christian Religion*, and of the *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, is the most thorough, elaborate, and valuable. That the *History* is a perfect work, probably only a portion even of the admirers of the author would care to assert. Its style and rhetoric are not wholly to our taste; from its conclusions, as well as from its philosophy, we are often led to differ. There is at times a vagueness in its statements, and a dimness cast over its discussions, which perplex us. We see the same defects in his *Life of Christ*, in which we are often left in doubt as to the theory which the author adopts, or the bearing of his opinions upon matters where a de-



cisive assertion would be very much to our satisfaction. Probably the constant influence of familiarity with a thousand conflicting fancies and theories had an insensible effect upon him, which he was not careful either to allow for or to resist in his own writings. And yet there is a vividness, an earnestness, a power in his pages, which equally please and instruct a reader. How such a man, and the author of such sentences and paragraphs as might be quoted from him, retained the repute and the savor of *Orthodoxy* among English and American admirers surpasses our comprehension. The merest shadow of that system is all that can be made to appear in his works, and we can scarcely be said to find even that there, unless we look aside to the right hand or to the left. Indeed, we have seen many significant hints in Orthodox pages this side of the water, that Neander was one of the friends from whose pleading and advocacy they wished themselves to be delivered.

Many anecdotes are related by the pupils and acquaintances of Neander illustrative of his eccentricities, his absence of mind, his ungainly and untidy ways, and his nervous manner in his public lectures. We hope that these stories are exaggerated. We take no pleasure in being informed that his sister found it necessary to watch by the lecture-room daily, that she might show him the way home, or that he neglected to dress himself decently, or that he delivered his lessons with his legs swung over a chair. We cannot avoid the misgiving, that there is more or less of affectation in such extreme absence of mind and slovenliness. At any rate, they do not enter into the essential or the ornamental parts of the Christian scholar and gentleman. Doubtless his oddities have been overstated.

The correspondence of such a man with such men as those with whom he exchanged epistles must have a high interest and value. One or more volumes of these materials, with whatever papers of autobiographical or personal contents he may have left behind him, would be highly prized by us, and we shall look forward with the hope that we may be thus gratified.

---

*Literary Addresses.* — During the season of the year which is just closing upon us, the columns of the weekly and the daily papers throughout New England, and some of the adjoining States, and the fresh pamphlets in our bookshops, bear witness to the number of occasions for the delivery of literary addresses. Indeed, pamphlets of this general character are evidently multiplying around us, to a degree which indicates that they are to form a large department of what we call American literature. A few words upon what may be and what ought to be the character and material of such addresses will not be out of place.

Not only our colleges, but our larger and more ambitious academies and seminaries for pupils of either sex, have now a day or an evening set apart for an annual festival consecrated to letters. The services of our men of genius and distinction are enlisted for the delivery of orations and poems. The number of such occasions will surprise any one who may not have kept pace with the yearly addition which is made to them. Within our memory, — and that not a long one, — the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge was the only literary society known to us by the observance of such an anniversary. But now, even the existence of some of our literary institutions, in town and country, has been first



revealed to us by the sight of newspaper paragraphs announcing the orators and poets for their summer anniversaries. The same news items have also made known to us how many gentlemen there are who are available for such occasions, and who stand ready to produce what shall fill up, however it may meet and satisfy the expectations of, the hour. Literary Societies, Academic Brotherhoods, Adelpic Unions, Associations of Alumni, and fraternities designated by two or more letters of the Greek alphabet, are formed for the sole purpose of paying this tribute to letters, or of exacting this service from them.

When, however, we examine, even without a purpose of criticism, the contents and character of such of these performances as we read or hear, we are led to infer, either that the number of them is too large, or that some who deliver them are incompetent to their work, or that the proper demands of the occasions are not understood. Doubtless the occasions are actually too numerous to assure success for each, and the yearly draft at so many open fountains is more than our best mental springs will supply. But the most frequent cause of failure is a disregard, on the part of the orator, and sometimes on the part of the poet, of the specific design of these occasions, and a want of harmony with their spirit as literary festivals.

Themes of an exclusively literary and intellectual character are most appropriate to such occasions, and these themes are certainly abundantly fruitful. The pleasures, tasks, and responsibilities of the literary life; the laws, and labors, and growth of the intellect; the interests of good letters, as embracing language, ethnology, criticism, and biography, with the whole range of illustration from the wealth of libraries, from fields whose diligent gleaning will draw even from their surface the riches as of deep mines, more precious than all their previous harvestings; the cause of education, from its summit-peaks of high science and scholarship, down to its most popular levels; the claims of our literary institutions upon the patronage of wealth, and the intelligent favor of the representatives of the people, — here are abundant themes suited to demonstrative eloquence in the academic hall, before literary brotherhoods on their summer anniversaries. One would think that, when an elected orator was seeking for a subject, he could not avoid such as these, which must press upon his mind and invite and allure him. But how is it in fact? These subjects are avoided, and the substitutes which are chosen for them are sometimes utterly out of harmony with the occasion. Not infrequently the so-called oration is a farrago of commonplaces, a threadless, incongruous, and impertinent succession of sentences, whose prosy wearisomeness gives vexation to an audience, broken only by occasional clapping for a poor pun or a hard witticism. We wish that it might be understood that political, controversial, reformatory, and anti-reformatory harangues, and all commonplaces of all sorts, are out of time and out of place on our literary festivals.

Nor need there be any fear that other subjects — subjects, too, of confessedly higher importance than any literary themes — should fail of their dues if excluded from these occasions. For other occasions in full abundance, even to the making of an Indian bead-string of the days of our year, give time and place for every topic of serious or pleasant interest to us. There are occasions without number for political addresses, on elections to office and retirements from it, in letters and speeches before the nation and before its states, districts, counties, towns, and villages.



There are occasions for patriotic harangues, on our battle anniversaries, and on our day of national observance. There are occasions for religious and charitable appeals, on the weekly Sunday, through Anniversary Week, and before audiences called together for the express purpose, a condition which will make such appeals appropriate at any time and in any place. Nor do we lack proper and numerous occasions for the advocacy of great reforms, and even for criticisms upon the measures of reformers, if any one finds it in his heart to spend his time in finding fault where he had better set himself at work. We have occasions when a horticultural or an agricultural oration is the very zest of the hour. All orderly housekeepers, having been to the market in the morning and purchased their food chosen for the day, look, when they go home to dine, to find on their tables what they expected, and if the viands are changed, even though it be for the better, may feel disappointed. But if something was substituted on their tables which they positively disliked, the failure of their expectations would be but half their trial. There are many sympathies between the spiritual and the carnal nature in man, and therefore much the same trial in its various degrees is experienced when an expected address is not in the mood of the hour, — literary or scholarly.

Certain pamphlets that are lying by us, and some newspaper reports which we have read, afford us materials to illustrate what we have above written, but we forbear.

---

*Commencement at Harvard College.* — Under a warm sun, as usual, though with a fresh breeze for those who were so situated as to feel it, the great annual festival day at Cambridge assembled its honored and goodly company on July 17th. The members of the graduating class, to the number of sixty-five, furnished about thirty speakers, who, in brief orations, essays, and poems, in the Latin and English languages, occupied nearly five hours in the church, and then received in course their Bachelor's Degree. The composition and delivery of the parts showed no lack of interest in speakers or hearers, and parents and friends seemed pleased with the exercises. The Degree of Doctor in Medicine was conferred upon thirty-three candidates, who had attended the prescribed course of medical instruction. The Degree of Bachelor of Laws was conferred upon thirty-six candidates. The President then announced the following Honorary Degrees, as conferred by the Corporation, with the consent of the Board of Overseers.

The Degree of Doctor in Theology, upon Rev. George W. Blagden of Boston, Rev. W. P. Lunt of Quincy, Rev. Joseph Torrey of Burlington, Vt., Rev. Frederic A. Farley of Brooklyn, New York, and Rev. Thomas J. Sawyer of Clinton, New York.

The Degree of Doctor of Laws, upon George Ticknor and Charles G. Loring, of Boston, Charles King of New York, Ebenezer Lane of Ohio, and Francis Lieber of South Carolina.

The Degree of Master of Arts, upon Charles H. Olmsted of Hartford, Ct., Thomas T. Bouvé of Boston, George Livermore of Cambridge, Rev. Lucius R. Paige of Cambridge, Rev. Thomas S. King of Boston, and H. T. Tuckerman of New York.

The Degree of Doctor in Medicine, upon Dr. Rufus Longley of Haverhill.



After the dinner in Harvard Hall, and the singing of the usual psalm, President Sparks resigned the chair to Hon. Edward Everett, as a Vice-President of the Association of the Alumni, and then for the first time an observance was introduced, which it is designed and hoped shall always henceforward attend this occasion. Mr. Everett read over twice, once continuously, and the second time with pauses, the list of graduates who had deceased since the last Commencement; the pauses being designed to give opportunity for commemorative remarks from classmates or friends of the departed. As nearly as could be ascertained, forty-two of the graduates were known to have died during the last Academic year. Of course the list cannot be expected to be always full or perfectly accurate, as the sons of the College are spread over the whole surface of the earth. Several whose names were read were appropriately and touchingly brought back to the honored halls from which they had gone out for ever. The oldest surviving graduate, Mr. James Lovell, formerly of Boston, died in South Carolina a week before Commencement, aged 93. He graduated in 1776. Samuel Payson, Esq., of Charlestown, Mass., is now the oldest survivor, and, with his classmate, the Hon. John Welles of Boston, marks the class of 1782 as the farthest back upon the catalogue which contains names without a star. Dr. Benjamin Abbot, the late well-known principal of Exeter Academy, was commemorated by Francis Bowen, elect Professor of History. Ex-President Everett paid a most genial tribute to the late beloved Dr. Pierce. Rev. Jeroboam Parker, Hon. Stephen Longfellow, Rev. Charles Train, Hon. Theodore Lyman, and others, found due mention and notice. The late Dr. George Parkman was among the departed of the year. Sadness followed the mention of his name. In the lecture-room above the dining-hall, the Alumni then proceeded to elect the officers of the Association for the coming year, as follows:—Hon. Edward Everett, President; Hon. Josiah Quincy, jr., and Hon. Charles H. Warren, Vice-Presidents; and Rev. S. K. Lothrop, Secretary.

---

*Phi Beta Kappa Society.*—The anniversary exercises of this literary fraternity were held in the First Church in Cambridge, on Thursday, July 18th. After prayer by Rev. S. K. Lothrop, Judge Timothy Walker, of Cincinnati, Ohio, the orator of the day, delivered an oration on "The Reform Spirit of the Day." (Published by J. Munroe & Co., Boston, 8vo, pp. 38.) The powerful tones of the orator's voice gave emphasis to the words in which, with great plainness, and without aiming after rhetorical graces, he described the spirit of destruction, change, and innovation, and the almost universal ultraism, of our day. He applied his theme to the whole circle of human interests, and aimed to inculcate that wisdom which, with a wise conservatism, seeks only after changes for the better.

The poem followed, by J. Bayard Taylor, of New York,—a production which exhibited fine thought, beautiful imagery, and smooth versification. His theme was, the Materials in Scenery, Legends, and History which America affords for the Poet's Art.

---

*The Dublin Review on the Inquisition.*—The Dublin Review, the great organ of the English Roman Catholics, and a quarterly which is



conducted with great ability, contains in the number for July two articles of prominent importance, a sketch of which may not be without interest to some of our readers. The first of these articles is upon the Inquisition, and upon the Principle of Intolerance in general, as made the basis of long-standing censure against the Roman Church. The writer introduces the subject by affirming that, as in the old French Revolution, so in the recent Roman tumult, a virulent spite against the Church has spent itself in vamping tales of horror about the "Holy Office." He sets himself to the task of relieving his communion from some of the odium which it has long borne for its intolerance, and its secret tribunals. His first suggestion is, that nothing is more common or more unjust than eulogies of the philosophical and tolerant character of the ancient religions, as if thus in contrast with the bigotry of Rome. The Egyptians and Persians, the Greeks and the Jews, and even the Romans, are shown to have been intolerant, and severely so. A second point insisted upon is, that the persecuting spirit in the Christian Church was not first called out and exercised in the Middle Ages, but was born from the moment in which the hand of violence from Paganism became powerless against the Church. Jews and heretics, Arians, Athanasians, and Pagans, in turn felt its severity. The writer next presses the familiar argument, that not Catholics alone, but all Christian sects that have had the power, have been persecutors, a charge from which they are not exempt who have claimed the largest liberty of thought and worship. The fourth suggestion in the plea of the writer embraces several specifications, and is very elaborately presented, though, as we think, it is not without a degree of sophistry. He says that, in considering the course of the Catholics in reference to the question of religious toleration, it is the invariable practice to judge them, not in accordance with their own principles, but by the ideas and principles of their accusers. The Roman Church recognizes a fixed and acknowledged standard of doctrinal truth, a departure from which is a culpable error, a *crime of the intellect*; hence a theory of punishment for errors of the intellect is conceivable in that Church, though according to Protestant principles it would be a contradiction and an absurdity. The obvious answer to this sophistry is, that what the writer so falsely calls *the Church* — as if he meant something identical with the idea of Jesus Christ — makes a most unwarranted and impudent encroachment when it pretends to define and punish a *crime of the intellect*. There is more weight in the next two considerations urged by the writer, namely, that progress has changed the ideas, feelings, principles, and institutions which once universally prevailed, and substituted for them milder measures and sentiments, and also, that men's notions of the theory of punishment have been generally softened, so that it is unjust to judge a past age by the light of the present. The writer affirms that the erection of the Inquisition as a distinct tribunal involved no new principle, enacted no new laws, but simply watched over the enforcement of ancient laws which were not peculiar to Catholic states, and at a time when the criminal code of Europe was more severe than it now is, and when crimes against religion were held punishable by the civil power. Still, the writer boldly maintains that the modern system of universal toleration is founded upon unsound fallacies, and is, in fact, utterly impracticable. To sustain this assertion, he quotes the work of Balmez, — "Protestantism and Catholicism compared." That author supposes the case of



a religion which requires human sacrifices as seeking to establish itself, — say in England, — and asserts that, as to deny it liberty would be to violate the consciences of its disciples, that denial which would of course be visited upon it involves intolerance, and therefore proves our modern Protestant principle impracticable. How absurd is the plea! We answer it by simply denying the right of any human being to have a religion which involves the lives of other human beings. He also supposes that an infamous worship like that formerly paid to the Goddess of Love, or that licentious doctrines like those of Matthew of Haerlem or John of Leyden, might ask for tolerance, the denial of which would impugn our Protestantism. To this we answer, that as immorality never can make itself religion, it can never ask for the toleration which is claimed for religion.

The writer in the Review goes on to argue, that the profession of any doctrine which is directly opposed to the interests of morality, of society, and the safety of the state, ceases to be a *merely spiritual offence*, becomes a crime against society, and is subject to the cognizance of the civil power. Even should a doctrine seem innocuous, and admit of being made an offence against the state by the turbulence, fanaticism, or disloyalty of its teacher, it is directly punishable as a social or political offence. We deny altogether the justice of this argument, as thus generally stated, and we allege the fact, that it is proved to be practically and actually falsified by experience. Protestant states do not take cognizance of the most dangerous *doctrines*, till they really produce immoral, seditious, or treasonable effects in *practice*, nor always even then. The institution of the "Agapemone" in England was allowed to pass unnoticed by the civil law, till an individual concerned in it appealed for protection from an outrage which it involved against the parental relation. Nor were the absurd and mischievous principles of the "Agapemone" interfered with in the slightest degree when the civil law held one of its members amenable to the duties of a husband and a father. Again, the doctrines and practices of the Shakers might be constructively regarded as prejudicial to morality, society, and the state. But they are unmolested. We doubt whether they would be undisturbed in a Roman Catholic country, unless it might be that the views of that Church concerning celibacy and virginity would throw over them the veil of honor. Again, Turkey has, till now, been diplomatically represented in Paris by the Prince Callimaki, who has been a distinguished and much courted guest and host in the *salons* of that city. He has generously denied himself his Ottoman privilege of a plurality of wives during his official residence. But who can suppose that in France, or in any other country not merely negatively, but positively, Protestant, he would have been interfered with had he chosen to establish a harem?

Once more, the writer in the Review boldly maintains, that, in a community which is still of one faith, and especially which recognizes one standard of belief, to which all are bound to submit, the introduction of new and distracting opinions may be resisted as a mere measure of civil police, and the government may prohibit all attempts at innovation, and punish its authors, not for their doctrines, but for their crimes against public order. Now the case thus supposed, of unity of faith and one recognized standard of belief, regarded as not only of religious authority, but as vitally important to civil and social order, was precisely the state



of things which once existed here in Massachusetts. If the principle asserted had been enforced here, there would not now be a single Roman Catholic church in this Commonwealth. What would our pleader have to say under this application of his theory? The writer goes on to hint at another ground of justification for his Church, though he does nothing more than state it, namely, that, from the very nature of the offence of heresy, its fatal influence upon society makes it as much more amenable to a civil and criminal process than counterfeiting, coining, or any like crime, as the life of the soul exceeds the goods of the body. But who shall define what heresy is? Indeed, we know of no process so likely to make a heretic, as the attempt to define heresy, in its modern sense, and to proceed to punish others on the strength of one's own definition of it.

The article before us then devotes more than a score of pages to redeem the Inquisition from its load of infamy. Premising that, excepting later times, especially in Spain, there was not a single sect or party for whose suppression the Inquisition exerted its agency, that did not involve anti-social, turbulent, or immoral practices, the writer asserts that in its very origin it indicated a coalition of the civil and ecclesiastical powers. Its occasional and incidental iniquities are candidly allowed by the writer, who says that "it arose in disorderly and unnatural times, and it gradually expired with the circumstances in which it arose." It speedily became inoperative in France, and comparatively so in Italy. Protestant odium is chiefly concentrated upon the modern tribunal in Spain. The writer yields this point with but a feeble attempt at extenuation. The tribunal there originated and sustained itself under peculiar circumstances. It was revived under the zeal of Ferdinand and Isabella, as a royal institution, receiving its sanction indeed from Pope Sixtus the Fourth, but afterwards sturdily maintaining its independence of the Papal authority, which was in vain exerted to check and resist its barbarities. These barbarities, however, are said to have been grossly exaggerated, and a brief exposure of some of the alleged errors in Llorente's well-known "Critical History of the Inquisition," is presented, and to a degree substantiated. The reputed number of its victims is greatly diminished; its use of torture is referred to the universal practice of the civil and criminal tribunals of the time, while its atrocities are denied, and its secrecy in its examinations, and the reception of testimony without confronting the witnesses with the accused, are also said to have been borrowed from the other courts.

We have thus gone through with an article which has engaged our attention not a little. We rejoice that so able a writer and so zealous a Roman Catholic has thought it desirable to attempt any thing like an apology for his Church in this matter of intolerance. If the article as a whole gives us little satisfaction, the writer would probably ascribe to the force of our prejudices what we must believe is chargeable upon the impossibility of the task which he has undertaken. He might make his argument stronger at every point, and especially in his distinction of the Spanish tribunal as withstanding the highest authority in the Church. He may also avail himself of the common plea of his fellow Romanists, that the ecclesiastical power never proceeded to extremities against heretics, but delivered them over for punishment to the secular power. We cannot allow ourselves to forget that the Inquisition, always, everywhere, and under all circumstances, exercised its functions



*to make and to retain disciples of the Roman Catholic Church, and that the secular power which tortured and burnt heretics had received its directions and its training for that work from the ecclesiastical power.* It was always for the interests of the Roman Church as a domineering hierarchy, an iron ruler of consciences, a cunning and scheming intermeddler in all the civil, social, and domestic relations of men and women, and not for the interests of science, true liberty, progress, intelligence, humanity, and real essential piety, that the Holy Office was employed, whether a minister of justice, a bishop, or a Dominican general presided over it.

Nor, in conclusion, do we admit the slightest degree of weight or justice in the counter-charge which is brought against Protestantism and Puritanism, of having been intolerant and persecuting where they have had the power to be so. On the contrary, without denying the fact, it seems to us to aggravate the burden of sin which rests upon the Roman and the Prelatical Churches. It was in those Churches that Protestants and Puritans received their education. So deeply was the spirit of intolerance, of civil liability for religious opinions, inwrought into the essence of the Roman, and even of the Episcopal Church, that our fathers never dreamed of denying the principle altogether. They took for granted, that a spirit from which they had suffered so much was right in itself, though wrong only in the method and subjects of its exercise. They thought intolerance *in some shape* was an essential part of religion, and so they practised it from the force of long habit and sufferance. We hold the Roman and Prelatical Churches accountable for all the intolerance of our Protestant and Puritan fathers. Full and unanswerable evidence might be adduced to prove this point. It is enough for us now to intimate, that, as true Protestantism becomes daily more truly liberal, it proves that intolerance is not a principle essential to it, while Romanism and Prelacy still cling to their usurped and tyrannical authority.

---

*Dr. Achilli.* — The other article in the Dublin Review to which curiosity drew our attention bears the name of Dr. Achilli. During the events of the siege of Rome the last year, many interesting episodes occurred to divide the anxious earnestness with which the current of events was watched by all Christendom. The great stake was the continuance of the Papacy, — that stake is not yet decided. The rivalries between France and Austria: the relation of Naples to the Roman See: the proposed intermeddling of Spain: the actual, though informal, interference of Great Britain, — formed lesser, but still very exciting incidents dependent upon and entering into the main issue. The fate of pictures, statues, and other works of art, was also involved. But yet another matter of interest engaged the chief attention of a large party in the religious world, who, availing themselves of the distracted state of things in the Eternal City, were employing diligent agents to circulate tracts and Bibles, and by secret and well-devised channels were kept advised of the progress of their portion of the work of revolution and proselytism. This party was that which is technically called the *Evangelical* party. We are inclined to believe that a vast deal more has been accomplished through the efforts of various associations in this body, than has as yet come fully to the light. It is a very strong and a very active



and a very zealous body, and it has diligently used its means of serving the cause of religious liberty indirectly, if not directly, by giving vast annoyance to the Roman ecclesiastics. England, Scotland, and Ireland, France, Switzerland, and the United States, have contributed largely to this enterprise. A large number of Bibles, tracts, fly-sheets, catechisms, and newspapers have been put in circulation, and several very effective assaults have been aimed against the various institutions of Rome.

Those who have taken even but a passing notice of events as they transpired, and read the paragraphs in our papers which gave the incidents of the siege, of the French military occupation, and of the return of Pius the Ninth, were constantly informed by each arrival of the fate, the fortunes, and the experience of a certain Dr. Achilli. The importance which the Orthodox journals attached to the proceedings in reference to him seemed to exceed in some minds the interest of the main issue. He was described as formerly a Roman priest and prior, who had filled several distinguished professorships in the Church with high fame for learning, virtue, and eloquence, but who had renounced Romanism and its dignities, had become a Protestant "of five years' standing," a zealous Evangelical proselyter, an agent of Bible and tract circulation, and of course a victim of the Inquisition, and a prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo, for having married a wife, broken his vows, and become a pestilent heretic and disorganizer. The fate of this man seemed in the minds of many of our religious editors and letter-writers to have become identified with the cause of the Roman republic and of religious liberty for Italy. After each successive arrival, our papers had something to say about the imprisonment of Dr. Achilli, intimating that he might be secretly made way with, till at length, through the influence of the *Evangelical* party, all but diplomatic proceedings were instituted for his release. Messrs. Craig and Touna, "Honorary Secretaries of the Committee of the London Society for the Religious Improvement of Italy and the Italians," in a memorial addressed to the government of France, earnestly demanded his liberty, and he was accordingly, through a powerful influence, allowed to pass from the prison-walls, and to go where he pleased beyond the borders of the States of the Church.

Another succession of newspaper paragraphs for the last six months has described a series of Evangelical ovations which have been made for Dr. Achilli in Great Britain. He has told the story of his conversion, of his wrongs, and of his labors, has exposed the iniquitous secrets from whose abettors he has cleared himself, has written sundry very independent letters to the Pope, and upon platforms and at tea-parties has been lionized as a martyr and an apostle. His life has been written by a very distinguished Evangelical lay leader, Sir Culling Eardley Eardley, and while throngs have attended upon him in various places, thousands who have never seen him have become interested in him. With what misgivings we have noted all these accounts, it is of no consequence that we should acquaint our readers. Our apprehensions as to the integrity, the purity of motive, the fitness and desert of the man, and our utter mistrust of the wisdom of the course which he and his friends were pursuing, were founded upon general facts and previous experience. We had, to speak briefly, no faith in the man, nor in his story, and we felt satisfied that all these overtures to him would tell, in the



long run, more for the Roman Church than against it, that he was ministering to a weak and ignorant bigotry, not to an enlightened piety, and that a development must come out, to the credit neither of himself, of his abettors, nor of his cause. The Exeter-Hall no-Popery rant, the Evangelical parties over tea and buns, and the platform writings of a poor and superficial spirit of proselytism, never will help the cause of religious liberty, or meet the issues of our controversy with Rome. Previous experience, too, has over and over again warned us to beware of noisy apostates and converts, of wandering proselyters and lecturers against their former brethren or religious communion. We have had them on this side of the water, and we avoid them. They invariably show a bad spirit, and if they are not actually burdened with disgrace, they seldom harm their former brethren so much as those who adopt them. A very different course and demeanour befit a sincere convert. His very experience will have humbled him and taught him gentleness and dignity of thought, modesty of behaviour, and forbearance of speech. If he was ever a sincere disciple of the fold which he has left, some of his heart-strings will yet and always cling to it, and friends among the living and the dead will make his memories of it to be tender. The last thing which such a convert will do will be to become a platform ranter, or a retailer of scandals at tea-parties among an odious assembly of viperous bigots. Especially in such a controversy as that between the Roman Church and Protestantism do we pray deliverance from all such instruments on either side. There are great principles at issue which minds properly informed may discuss with any degree of earnestness and spirit, and with such a sense of the tremendous importance in past history and over times to come of the matters that enter into the controversy, that they shall be borne above the miserable artifices which have often disgraced both parties.

The Dublin Review gives us from authentic documents, and from police records, a complete history of the so-called Dr. Achilli, who has no claim to the title which he assumes. He was ordained a priest of the Roman Church, and all that the Roman Inquisition ever had to do with him was to deprive him of all his functions because of his most flagitious conduct in repeated acts of seduction and crime. He is proved to be utterly unworthy of credit, a very base and bad man, and a most unquestionable impostor.

---

#### RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Anniversary of the Theological School at Meadville, Pa.* — The exercises connected with the anniversary of this flourishing institution took place on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, June 25th, 26th, and 27th, in the Independent Church in that borough. On Tuesday evening a meeting was held, in which the members of the School were addressed by the Professors, by Elders Church and Barnham of the Christian Connection, and by Messrs. Peabody and Tiffany, the latter of whom has lately returned from his theological studies in Germany. The chief subjects of remark were the aims and objects, the encouragements and responsibilities, of the Christian ministry at the present time. The Sermon to the Graduating Class was preached by the Rev.



A. P. Peabody, of Portsmouth, N. H., on "The Work of the Ministry." The theses by the members of the graduating class were read on Thursday, as follows: — "The Resurrection of Christ," William Bradley; "The Field is the World," Bryan J. Butts; "Christian Union," Ammirus Darrow; "Francis Xavier," William A. Fuller; "The Psalms of David," Sawyer A. Hutchinson; "The Doctrine of Election," John Orrell; "The Pulpit a Throne," George W. Webster; "The Pastor," John McCarty. The words of sympathy, of advice, and of farewell, by which President Stebbins accompanied the delivery of the certificates to those whom he dismissed to their chosen work, were earnest, wise, and affectionate.

An association for religious and literary purposes has been formed among the graduates of the Meadville School, and the Rev. George J. Ball, of Upton, Mass., has been chosen to deliver the first annual address, at the next anniversary.

The *Meadville Theological School* has now completed the sixth year of its existence, and appears to have realized every expectation of its friends. The class which graduated this year numbered eight, and the whole number of students who have been or are connected with it is seventy-one. The majority of these have come in nearly equal proportions from the Christian and Unitarian bodies. Four other denominations have also contributed a small quota. Fourteen States and the Province of Canada have been represented among its pupils. Graduates of the institution are settled or preaching at Rockstream, Jefferson, Buffalo, Chicago, Dayton, St. Louis, Rockford, Northumberland, and other points in the Middle and Western States, besides some who are travelling on missionary ground, and one who is engaged as a colporteur. A few also are settled in New England. Of the twenty-six who pursued their studies in the institution during the past year, only two came from the Unitarian societies of New England. This would indicate that the fears which have been expressed of its interfering with Cambridge are ill grounded. It has opened for itself new sources of supply, which are likely to increase in copiousness. The prospect for the next year's class is better than usual. Three members of it have already arrived in Meadville, and the whole number will probably reach, if not exceed, a dozen.

The library of the institution contains 5,400 volumes, and private libraries are open to the students, which contain nearly 4,000. The regular course of instruction lasts three years, but if any, for the sake of greater thoroughness, or in order to make up for previous deficiency, desire to remain four, they will find a course of study adapted to their wants. For such as are already engaged in the ministry, or whose circumstances in life preclude them from remaining three years, a one or two years' course is provided. The object of those who manage the institution is to meet the wants of the community, — to furnish a *thorough* theological education to all who are ready to receive it, yet not to send away empty such as must choose between a less complete course and none at all.

The locality of the school is healthy, and is destined to become peculiarly accessible. On this latter point a word of explanation may be satisfactory to some of our readers. Two main railroad routes are now in course of construction through the free States, from east to west. To form one of these, the lines from Boston and New York unite on



the southern shore of Lake Erie, at Dunkirk, to and beyond which point they will be finished during the ensuing year. Thence through Chicago to the Mississippi at Galena, the largest part of the road is either under contract or finished. The other line, from Philadelphia to St. Louis, is completed, or under contract, with trifling exceptions, from the former city to the western boundary of Ohio, and, we believe, also through part of Indiana. These roads, which connect by branches with the entire surface of the free States, and along which all travel between the east and west must pass, are forced by the convergence of Lake Erie and the Ohio at the western extremity of Pennsylvania to within eighty miles of each other; and Meadville is situated almost in the line of convergence. The lake will, sooner or later, be connected at this point with the Ohio, by a railroad, the charter for which has already been obtained, and the ground for which is favorable, a canal being already in operation between the two points.

In the Meadville School there are five professors, of whom three are resident and two non-resident. Of the resident professors, one derives the larger part of his support from the Unitarian Society at Meadville, as its pastor, and the labors of one are gratuitous. The non-resident professors visit the school annually, to deliver their respective courses of lectures. They receive no compensation for their services, their expenses alone being defrayed. The funded property of the school amounts to \$7,000. Its other property is valued at \$5,000. The expenses of the school are covered chiefly by annual subscriptions or contributions, and amount to but \$1,400 for salaries, and from \$300 to \$350 for contingent expenses. It is earnestly to be desired that the permanent funds of the institution should be increased, since, in obtaining officers of instruction, an unendowed cannot offer the same inducements as an endowed institution, and may fail of commanding those services without which both it and the community that depends on it must suffer.

A want scarcely less serious than the foregoing is that of a building for the general purposes of the school. The present edifice contains a chapel and two recitation-rooms, but affords inadequate, and no separate, accommodation for the library. No lodging-houses are owned by the school, and those which it has been obliged to lease are so ill adapted to that purpose as to be no light trial both to officers and students. By an estimate made, it seems that for \$6,500 a brick building could be erected, which should contain a chapel, library, recitation-rooms, custodian's apartments, and commodious quarters for thirty-five students. The grounds and part of the foregoing sum will be furnished in Meadville, where a liberal contribution is also ready whenever an effort shall be made to endow the school. Most sincerely do we hope that Liberal Christians will not be long in furnishing the moderate sum requisite to the security and prosperity of the institution.

---

*Theological School at Cambridge.* — The Sermon before the Graduating Class from the Divinity School at Cambridge — the preacher being chosen by the members of the class — was preached by the Rev. John Weiss, of New Bedford, in the Church of the First Parish, on Sunday evening, July 14th. The discourse was of a highly philosophical character, one of a class of performances which we ourselves do not love on such occasions, if on any occasion, but which we think it unfair to crit-



icize unless we have the printed pages before us with the full sanction of the author. Hegelianism, in all its shapes and aspects, in all the degrees of its advocacy, and even in the hard terms of speech and the remote conceptions through which it must be examined for rejection, is to us so far apart from the needful training of a Gospel minister that we should never be tempted to discuss it.

The exercises at the Thirty-fourth Annual Visitation of the Divinity School took place at the College Chapel on Tuesday, July 16. After prayer by Professor Noyes, theses were read by the three members of the Graduating Class as follows:—“The Hebrew Prophet,” by Mr. Amory Battles. “Does Free Inquiry in Religion diminish the Influence of the Clergy?” by Mr. Charles J. Bowen. “The Reformation in the English Church in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” by Mr. Charles E. Hodges. The exercises, divided by the singing of three hymns, were closed with prayer by Professor Francis.

The journals of several of the religious denominations around us have found matter of surprise, or amusement, or triumph, according to their spirit, in the unprecedentedly small number of candidates which Cambridge sends forth this year to the great work of the Christian ministry. That there is in this single fact, however, any indication of the general condition or prospects of our denomination, it would be wholly unnecessary for us to attempt to disprove.

That any of us, whose sympathies and labors are engaged in what is called Liberal Christianity, should be satisfied, or otherwise than pained, with the apparently unattractive and unprosperous condition of our Divinity School, it would be vain to deny or to disguise. Looking at the matter from any point of view from which we may contemplate it, we are equally disappointed, though not discouraged, or without faith in a better time to come. When we consider what large sums have been contributed by the piety and zeal of the last generation of our brethren to provide a comfortable dwelling for pupils, and the means for their thorough education in sacred learning and in all the culture of mind and heart which is desirable in Christian teachers, and when we think of the advantages which are thus offered at Cambridge, in its two faithful and laborious professors, its libraries, and its social influences, we cannot but ask, Why does not more come from all these sources of good? As we look over the records of the Society for the Promotion of Theological Education at Cambridge, by whose efforts and donations the School was founded and endowed, we have before our eyes the names of many of the most distinguished and honored laymen and ministers of this neighbourhood, — nearly all of them now numbered among the departed, — who lavished their best affection and gifts upon this School, and looked to it for widely extended, for permanent, and ever-increasing effects. That it has done a noble and a beneficent work, and has in some measure fulfilled the hopes of its founders, we gratefully acknowledge. But its means are not fully honored in its present work and fruits. We believe that its prospects will yet brighten, and that after having felt all the discouraging influence of many trying experiences through which our community has passed, it will yet find more favor with God and with man. The primary and most effective cause of the present condition of the School at Cambridge is to be found lying entirely behind and utterly distinct from any thing that concerns especially our own religious denomination. If we felt the slightest in-



clination to reply to the unfriendly remarks which we have noticed in the sectarian newspapers, we have at our hands abundant means for proving that all the other religious bodies experience precisely the same perplexities and trials that are visited upon us, as well as others from which we are free. The General Theological Seminary at New York (Episcopal) is convulsed with the discords and contentions which keep the sect to which it belongs in constant agitation. The seminaries at Andover, Windsor, Bangor, and Princeton live in the midst of theological party contentions, and at the same time find it difficult to fill their halls with pupils. The famous American Education Society, which a few years ago was a most vigorous and efficient association, inspiring by its own overflowing energies the churches of the large and strong body which sustained it, is now in a languishing and almost a dying condition. The Rev. Mr. Stearns of Cambridgeport, one of the most beloved and influential clergymen of the Orthodox Congregationalists, has declined the urgent appeal made to him to become its Secretary, and its prospects are all the less hopeful because of the spasmodic existence of a rival society. The simple truth is, that the Christian ministry is not the same inviting, peaceful, and permanent sphere of life and duty which it once was, though it was never more needed, and never half so effective in its agency as it is now. It never embraced so large a relative proportion of the scholars and powerful minds of our own community. It never required any thing like the attainments and accomplishments which every little village society now wishes for in its pastor.

At the same time that the demands upon the ministry have so largely increased, a number of new avenues to public influence have been opened, and there are many other professions inviting those who in former generations would probably have entered its service. Our numerous colleges, academies, and high-schools, our scientific, architectural, constructive and engineering enterprises, and the whole wide field of prosperous and busy life around us, demand high talents, moral culture, and intelligence in the very large number of young men that are needed to fill all their attractive offices, and every one of these offices, with scarce an exception, has been created during the last half-century. Young men now can hardly be persuaded that they are any the less fulfilling the demands of a noble ambition, and performing an honorable service for God and man in either of these spheres of duty, than if they entered the ministry.

In the mean while the Christian ministry has come to present very many new trials, embarrassments, and difficulties. Its tenure is painfully uncertain to the husband and the father. Its mental standard is the highest. Its moral and social requisitions are the severest. An unsuccessful or dismissed minister, or a waiting and long-suffering candidate, is a terror to those who are meditating upon the choice of the ministry. And then the task involved in writing sermons for these days is wellnigh overwhelming. All the fundamental and vital matters which formerly were never touched, but were taken for granted, are now most freely discussed, and the whole philosophy of religion, of belief and unbelief, of Theism and Atheism and Pantheism, is read by some who sit in pews, and expected from our pulpits. If the secret breasts of some ministers could be revealed, we believe it would appear that more than one among them is, during alternate weeks, what used to



be called an infidel, and then a believer. And this is the consequence, not of any mental, moral, or spiritual error of the man himself, but of the strange discords of theory, speculation, and discussion with which an inquisitive mind is now beset. Then, too, a minister is now subject to all the caprices of the fault-finding, the difficult, the narrow-minded, and what are called the *influential* persons in his society. He must often either truckle, or suffer, — or both. What with the philosophers, the reformers, the come-outers, male and female, the *signers-off*, the penurious pew-owners, and the various discontents of some country parishes, he that is called to be a religious teacher will soon find himself attracted by a beautiful hymn of Logan's, which begins, "How still and peaceful is the grave."

Thus it is, that, entirely irrespective of sect or denomination, the Christian ministry has lost some of its ancient attractions, and gathered many new discomfitures and trials. That any young men now enter upon it, and pursue it, with single-hearted zeal, and with more than ordinary endowments, is actually a higher tribute to it than it received in the days of early martyrdom. We believe that all these perplexities beset the ministry among us. Some of them we feel to a much less degree, others to a much higher degree, than do other denominations or communions. They cannot but affect the minds of young men in their academic training, and while they are in college. If some who have entered the ministry in their youth had an opportunity of a new choice later in life, they would probably prefer some other sphere of labor; while, on the other hand, some who were repelled in their youth from the ministry would gladly adopt it if they could in later years. We think it, on the whole, objectionable, for many reasons, that the choice of a profession among us must be made so early in life. In the discourse which Dr. Gannett delivered before the Association of the Alumni on the afternoon of this day, he insisted upon the life-long, undeviating, and unchanging constancy of a minister to his profession. We admit that this would be the rule of duty and of all success, if every wise previous condition were regarded by those who entered upon the ministry. But many who in youth prepare themselves for that work, and commit themselves to it, find in themselves afterwards a lack of some or of all the qualities for success in it, some inaptitude or infelicity, some defect of voice, or manner, or mind, which incapacitates them from pleasing or edifying. Besides, it takes two parties to decide now-a-days whether a Christian minister shall continue in the ministry, and live by it, or even die by it.

We regret, we complain of, none of these trials and discomfitures which we have mentioned. We are willing that the ministry should retain its likeness from age to age to the apostolic pattern of a warfare, though against new enemies and trials. We consent to its terms and conditions among us. We will live in it and die in it, if the other party to the work allows us. Its vicissitudes of care and exaction and conflict are not without the accompaniment of honors when deserved, of satisfactions and rewards when earned by faithfulness, — for then only are they possible. When a sufficiency of time and experience has caused the present terms and conditions of the Christian ministry to be well understood, and has settled its relative demands and opportunities with those of other professions, we shall look for brighter days for all our theological schools, and especially for that at Cambridge. Till



then we wait in patience, resolved upon as little fault-finding as human nature can be healthfully content with. Of one thing we may be sure, that the world will no more dispense with religious teachers than with fuel and water. And those religious teachers must be Christian teachers till a better religion than that of Jesus Christ is invented by man or revealed to him.

*Meeting of the Association of the Alumni.*—This annual meeting of those who have received a theological education at Cambridge took place in the College Chapel in the afternoon. The Rev. Prof. Noyes declined a reelection as President. The officers chosen were, Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D., President; Rev. Ralph Sanger of Dover, Vice-President; Rev. J. F. W. Ware of Cambridgeport, Secretary; with a Standing Committee.

The Rev. Calvin Lincoln of Fitchburg having been already chosen as Preacher for next year, the Rev. Dr. Putnam was elected by ballot as Second Preacher.

The Annual Discourse was then delivered by the Rev. Dr. Gannett. His subject was Ministerial Devotedness, as the Condition of Obligation and of Success in the Christian Ministry. His chosen profession demands of the minister a concentrated, entire, constant, life-long, and single-hearted devotion. This claim should be met, it should be recognized in adherence to the profession through all trials, in the use of time, in the method of study, in preparation for the pulpit, in dress and manners and habits, and in every possible mode of influence. The preacher presented what were in his view the loftiest model, the most exacting duties, and the most serious obligations of a minister of Jesus Christ.

---

*Installation and Ordination.*—The REV. WILLIAM H. KINSLEY was installed as Minister of the First Congregational Society in MENDON, on June 10th. The Introductory Prayer was offered by Rev. Adin Ballou; Selections from Scripture, by Rev. Mr. Stacy; Sermon, by Rev. Dr. Gannett; Prayer of Installation, by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Uxbridge; Fellowship of the Churches, by Rev. Mr. Fuller of Manchester; Address to the Society, by Rev. A. Hill of Worcester.

MR. FRANCIS LE BARON, formerly of Plymouth, was ordained as an Evangelist and Minister at Large, in WORCESTER, on July 3d; the Services, which were held in the Church of the Unity, were as follows:—Introductory Prayer, by Rev. Warren Burton; Selections from Scripture, by Rev. George M. Bartol of Lancaster; Prayer of Ordination, by Rev. Dr. Kendall of Plymouth; Sermon, by Rev. John Weiss of New Bedford; Charge, by Rev. William B. Greene of Brookfield; Fellowship of the Churches, by Rev. E. E. Hale of Worcester; Concluding Prayer, by Rev. Alonzo Hill of Worcester.

---

*Dedication.*—The new church edifice erected by the Second Liberal Congregational Society in LOWELL, under the pastoral care of Rev. MR. BARRY, was dedicated on July 10th. The Dedicatory Discourse was preached by Rev. Dr. Gannett.